DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 702 HE 014 249

AUTHOR	Marshak, Robert E.
TITLE	Academic Renewal in the Seventies: Memoirs of a City College President.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	448p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC18 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Affirmative Action; College Presidents; Educational Change; *Educational History; *Ethnic Studies; Fund Raising; Higher Education; Liberal Arts; *Open Enrollment; Outreach Programs; Public Education; School Community Relationship; Social Problems; Universities; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*City University of New York City College; Institutional History

ABSTRACT

A personal account of the years 1970 to 1979 at The City College of New York is presented in the form of memoirs of the eighth president of City College, Robert E. Marshak. Topics discussed include: the history of City College, urban higher education, open admissions, the liberal arts, ethnic studies, professional training, biomedical education, community outreach of the college, fund-raising for urban public education, the tax-levy budget, and private fund-raising. It is argued that during the years between 1964 and 1970, colleges and universities were the centers of disruptions and social explosions that emanated from social, economic, political ethnic, and generational forces. Many American campuses were physically surrounded by racial minorities whose expectations and anticipations had been elevated to new highs by federal court decisions and legislation in the earlier years of the decade, and whose disappointment and frustration of the nonrealization of the promised improvements turned later to rage and hostility toward society, government, and the educational system itself. The response of City College in the seventies through education for urban students, improvement of the physical plant, and community outreach is documented. (CC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208702

ACADEMIC RENEWAL IN THE SEVENTIES: MEMOIRS OF A CITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

by

ROBERT E. MARSHAK

(with the assistance of GLADYS WURTEMBURG)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert E.
Marshak
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 014 219

Vol 2

© 1980 Robert E. Marshak

To my wife, Ruth -

who fell in love with City College

Table of Contents

Foreword p. iii

Preface p. 1

Chapter 1 - "The College's Humanistic Mission in a Changing City" p. 17

- §1 The First Century p. 18
- §2 The Creation of City University p. 22
- §3 Institutional Constraints on City College p. 26
- §4 Prelude to the South Campus Occupation p. 29

Chapter 2 - "From the Five Demands to the Urban Educational Model" p. 39

- §1 The Meaning of the Five Demands p. 39
- §2 Genesis of the Urban Educational Model p. 50
- §3 The Urban Educational Model p. 73

Chapter 3 - "Open Access, Open Admissions and Open Warfare" p. 87

- §1 Open Admissions (1970-1976) p. 87
- §2 Modified Open Admissions (1976-) p. 115
- §3 Open Warfare p. 131
- §4 The Gross Incident p. 149

Chapter 4 - "Liberal Arts in an Urban Environment p. 160

- §1 City College's Tradition of General Education and Career Training p. 160
- §2 Experiments in Non-Traditional Liberal Arts Education p. 167
- §3 New Directions in Liberal Arts Education p. 184

Chapter 5 - "Ethnicity, Ethnic Studies and the Third World" p. 202

- §1 The New Ethnicity and Genesis of the Ethnic Studies Departments p. 202
- §2 Problems and Promise of the Ethnic Studies Departments p. 217

  - 2a Puerto Rican Studies Department p. 218
  - 2b Asian Studies Department p. 221
  - 2c Black Studies Department p. 232
  - 2d Jewish Studies Department p. 252

- §3 Interethnic Programs at City College p. 258

Chapter 6 - "Training Tomorrow's Urban Professionals and Affirmative Action" p. 263

§1 Training Tomorrow's Professional Leaders for the Urban Community and Urban Legal Studies p. 263
§2 Center for Biomedical Education p 274
§3 Genesis of the Biomedical Suit p. 296
§4 The Biomedical Trial p. 331
§5 Aftermath of the Biomedical Trial p. 353

Chapter 7 - "Community Outreach of an Urban College" p. 364

§1 Pressures from the Inner City p. 364
§2 Community Outreach of the College p. 379
§3 Genesis of the Office of Community and Public Affairs p. 387
§4 Urban-Grant University Legislation p. 393

Chapter 8 - "Physical Master-Planning and Fund Raising for Public Higher Education" p. 401

§1 Physical Master Planning in an Urban Public College p. 402
§2 Tax-Levy Budget for City College p. 417
§3 Private Fundraising for an Urban Public College p. 421

Epilogue p. 437

Foreword

This report on my City College presidency (1970-79) was made possible by a Chairman's Grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. In my submission to Mr. Joseph Duffey, NEH Chairman, I wrote that "I wished to prepare an account of my interesting, frustrating and, on the whole, gratifying experience in this post, under the title 'The Urban Educational Model in Contemporary America' (perhaps the title should be 'Trials and Tribulations of an Urban Public College President')". The title of this actual accounting of my stewardship is less pretentious than the first and more serious than the second title suggested in my submission, but the experience itself - as I relived it during the course of writing - was correctly described. I hope that these memoirs will provide some impressionistic insights into the problems of American public higher education during the decade of the Seventies. I am deeply grateful to Joe Duffey for the opportunity to put down what I was trying to accomplish at City College for nine eventful years of my life.

These memoirs could not have been completed and, indeed, would not have been started without the assistance of Gladys Wurtemburg, Director of Public Relations at City College. Professor Kathleen Wahle and Mr. Andrew Kelly researched several chapters during the early stages of preparation. My former assistant, Robin Villa, located some of the public documents, quotations from which have added accuracy to my recollections. Professor Theodore Brown and Dr. Gerald Kauvar, two of my former academic assistants, gave me the benefit of their reading of an early draft. My secretary, Janet Manning, was responsible for the transcription, typing and production of the final manuscript. I extent my heartfelt thanks to one and all.

I also owe a deep debt of gratitude to numerous individuals and groups within and without City College and City University -- fellow administrators, faculty, students, alumni and friends -- for their advice and support during my years as president. I have expressed my indebtedness to many of these persons and groups as the story unfolds. However, a suitable occasion did not arise for me to pay tribute to Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee for his unstinting support of my efforts as City College president. I also wish to acknowledge the support given by three successive Boards of Higher Education, chaired respectively by Frederick Burkhardt, Alfred Giardino and Harold Jacobs, by the City University Construction Fund, chaired by Jack Poses, and by the City College Alumni Association and City College Fund. I would be happy if I succeeded in transforming these many kindnesses into something of lasting value to the College and the University.

Robert E. Marshak

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia
September 26, 1980

Preface

When I accepted the Presidency of The City College of New York at the end of February, 1970 (my duties were to commence September 1), my colleagues at the University of Rochester were flabbergasted and I must confess that I was taken aback by my own foolhardiness. I received the telephone call to meet with the City College Presidential Search Committee in early February and made the trip from Rochester to New York with the strong feeling that a change in career from physics professor at a wealthy private university in upstate New York to public college president in impoverished New York City was highly unlikely both in terms of the Search Committee's interest in me and my interest in the job. Within several days the City College presidency was inexplicably offered to me and I was confronted with the need to reach a decision in a span of several weeks. In view of my lack of administrative experience on a college-wide level (I had been a department chairman and had tired of that), the rapidity with which the offer was made was a clear signal that the Search Committee had reached a desperate stage in its search for the Eighth President of City College.

It is important to understand the reasons for the unattractiveness of the presidency of such a well-known college at the beginning of the Seventies. Soon after the offer was made, my wife, Ruth, and I paid a visit to the City College campus. Even this cursory visit revealed the scars of the Black and Puerto Rican student takeover of the South Campus ten months earlier. For example, the pervasive tension on the campus was exemplified by the presence of a full-time security guard outside the president's office, an unfamiliar sight in academe even in the late Sixties. (I dismissed the guard when I assumed office.) The rundown condition of the physical plant was brought home to us when we visited the Great Hall, a huge ceremonial space located in the largest of the neo-Gothic buildings on the North Campus; we were shocked by its state of disrepair. During my brief sojourn as a student at City College during the Spring of 1932, the Great Hall had been an adornment to the College and the city (many important convocations sponsored both by the College and the city had taken place in this magnificent hall in former years). Thirty-eight years later - in the Spring of 1970 - we found an almost empty cavernous room in great need of paint, with row upon row of chairs covered with dust. On the front stage, a small group of students in the school band were rehearsing without aplomb and, on some seats in the back row, a half dozen drunks sat contentedly enjoying the cacaphony. Our visit to the so-called President's house [the former Gate House to the Manhattanville College campus (South Campus)] was even more depressing; it had been occupied by the Music Department in a makeshift fashion after that department was forced to evacuate its regular quarters in the wake of a fire following the South Campus occupation.

These obvious signs of deterioration, when added to the anticipated problems of Open Admissions, ethnic sensitivity, alumni disaffection and community hostility, persuaded me that the new City College president would be confronted with all the difficulties, suspicions and conflicting pressures that one could possibly imagine. This convinced me that the City College presidency would be unmanageable in so many ways that it would constitute a genuinely challenging experiment in crisis resolution and human relations. I decided to accept the offer.

Having made the irrational decision to accept the City College presidency, I was greeted in the quiet confines of my University of Rochester office, within a week of the announcement of my acceptance, by a delegation of City College student reporters. The interview lasted several hours and after a round of questions concerning Open Admissions, the College's Physical Master Plan and my reasons for taking the job, one of the reporters quietly said to me: "I cannot understand why you would want the job: don't you know that heroin is rampant on the campus?" This turned out to be a gross exaggeration. There was a heroin problem on the City College campus (as The New York Times informed its readers in a front page article within a month of my arrival) but the problem was eradicated in six weeks through vigorous intervention by the Administration and the New York City police (see Chapter 7). But at the time the statement at the Rochester interview shook me and I began to wonder what had possessed me to accept the City College presidency.

On another level I was called upon to explain to the physics community, and the general scientific community, why I was abandoning my scientific career to accept a college presidency. At the University of Rochester, I was a "Distinguished University Professor" of Physics with no official teaching duties, founder in 1950 of the still-continuing International Conference on High Energy Physics, head of a research group in theoretical particle physics embracing many countries, member of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In short, I was one of the beneficiaries of the generous support given to academic research by a grateful and frightened nation after World War II. I enjoyed the good life of a pure scientist fully aware of the need to return to society contributions to its scientific culture and an augmented knowledge base for future technological applications. Under the circumstances, it was highly unusual (although becoming increasingly less so) to change over from a life of basic science to one of applied art, which is the most charitable way to characterize a college presidency in intellectual terms. There must have been deeper reasons for my willingness to surrender the security and excitement of my scientific career for the hard work, the certain frustrations and the uncertain gratifications of the City College presidency.

And, indeed, there were such reasons and most of those reasons applied, in my view, to the particular college presidency in question. I honestly believe that only the City Collage presidency could have persuaded me to put aside my scientific career for an indefinite period in the Spring of 1970. Let me explain. I was born and brought up in the South Bronx and commuted to James Monroe High School. My father and mother had come to the United States shortly after 1905, from different towns in White Russia, part of the great wave of Jewish emigration escaping at that time the heightened suppression in Czarist Russia. My father, at first a migrant farm laborer in upstate New York, married my mother when he advanced his career to the better paying but highly seasonal trade of garment cutter. Off-season, to provide a further source of income for the family (which also included two younger sisters), my father worked as a fruit peddler and my mother toiled as a seamstress in the garment industry. Upon graduation in January 1932 from high school, I entered City College as a freshman. I then had the choice that Fall of continuing at City College, which had free tuition, and working part-time or applying for a Pulitzer Scholarship to Columbia College, which would pay both tuition and my share of family expenses. The Pulitzer Scholarship was awarded each year to ten graduates of New York City public high schools and I was the only Jewish youngster to be chosen that year - a strange outcome considering the nature of the selection process, the number of excellent Jewish applicants whom I knew and the fact that the scholarships were financed by the Pulitzer family. This was my first - but definitely not my last - exposure to anti-semitism in higher education in pre-World War II America. My background of poverty in New York City, my brief but positive experience at City College, and my detestation of all forms of discrimination as a result of my contact with anti-semitism in those years, all had a bearing on my decision to accept the City College presidency in 1970.

Other reasons for surrendering the life of academic science in 1970 were an outgrowth of developments after World War II. My physics colleagues and I had participated actively in World War II research after Pearl Harbor, and our contributions - to radar, the proximity fuse, and the atomic bomb - were of major importance in winning the war. At the same time, our very successes led to deep pangs of conscience on the part of many of us after the war ended. A majority of the three-thousand-member organization, the Federation of Atomic Scientists, founded in 1946, to ensure that science and technology would benefit mankind and not destroy it, consisted of physicists. I was the second National Chairman of the Federation (FAS) in 1947-48 and we spent a great deal of time speech-making and lobbying on behalf of international control of atomic energy while the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States grew more intense. Let there be no mistake: although we worked very hard at our basic science (I developed the "two-meson' theory in particle physics during the same year I was FAS Chairman!). American scientists also accepted social responsibility for their handiwork. Initially we were primarily worried about atomic energy, but later many of us took leadership roles in combating the tyranny of the McCarthy era, in cracking the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act (which prevented foreign scientists from entering the United States on the pretext that they might be "fellow travelers"), in opening up scientific and scholarly exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe after Stalin's death, in rebuilding science in Western Europe and Japan, and in supporting efforts to enhance scientific research and advanced training in the developing countries.

I was directly involved in some of those initiatives and admired and empathized with my fellow physicist in the Soviet Union, Andrei Sakharov, when he published his thoughtful essay on "Progress, Co-Existence and Intellectual Freedom" in 1968 in which he wrote:

> "Civilization is imperiled by a universal thermonuclear war, catastrophic hunger for most of mankind, stupefaction from the narcotic of mass culture and bureaucratized dogmatism, a spreading of mass myths that put entire peoples and continents under the power of cruel and treacherous demagogues, and destruction or

degeneration from the unforseeable consequences of swift changes in the conditions of life on our planet".

All the activity I have cited here added up to demonstrating the powerful humanistic thrust propelling scientists throughout the world. For an advocate of this "new scientific humanism" - a term I liked to apply to the scientists' concern for social progress and human decency - it was not unreasonable to think of City College, with its own long-standing mission of educational humanism, as a suitable place to venture forth in improving the capacity of individuals and groups to understand and respond to the ever more pressing problems of the contemporary world.

There was another basic reason why the Search Committee for the City College presidency found me amenable to an interview in February 1970 and why, inexorably, I accepted the offer when it came. My "ivory tower" existence as a basic researcher had been disrupted since 1968 by the turmoil of campus politics at the University of Rochester. University students in many countries outside the United States had for decades taken the leadership in protesting against the social inequities, economic deprivations and anti-democratic trends in their national societies. American universities had seen very little of this activity except possibly for the student protest movements against war and fascism during the Thirties at metropolitan colleges like City College and Columbia. The situation changed during the Sixties when the anti-Viet Nam and Civil Rights movements converged on many campuses. These student protest movements spread quickly, and finally, about 1967-68, reached the campus of the University of Rochester. As it did elsewhere, student unrest at the University of Rochester polarized the faculty, brought community groups to the campus that had never before concerned themselves with the University, and finally produced a confrontation between Central Administration and other university constituencies. These developments soon engulfed me.

When the student problems of the late Sixties impinged on the University of Rochester campus and aroused the faculty from its normal political torpor, my colleagues pursuaded me to run for election to the newly-created Faculty Senate. I became Chairman of its Executive Committee and began to deal with the Central Administration of the University on an ongoing basis. As spokesman for the Faculty Senate, I quickly learned that the political-philosophic orientation of Central Administration determined the structure and effectiveness of campus governance and the dimensions of the university's service function in the larger society. The perspective of history can make wise men of us, and it is not my intention here to reopen the controversy between Central Administration and Faculty Senate at the University of Rochester during the period 1968-70. Differences of opinion with regard to issues of campus governance and the service role of the University of Rochester ultimately led to my resignation from the Faculty Senate. Consequently, when the offer of the City College Presidency came in the Spring of 1970, I felt a moral obligation and a great curiosity to test my own views of campus governance and college mission from the vantage point of the top administrative officer. In a word, the good life as an academic scientist had already been undermined by my active participation in the University of Rochester Faculty Senate. The perforce intense exposure to college-wide problems, challenges and opportunities made me vulnerable to a "tap on the shoulder" as college president when it came in the Spring of 1970.

But I still must explain why the "tap" had to be a City College "tap", or a reasonable facsimile thereof, if I was to be pursuaded to surrender the tarnished good life of an academic scientist. I was aware of the many differences between City College and the University of Rochester, even though they were founded about the same time. Rochester College originated as a private Baptist college in 1850 and operated modestly until George Eastman's largesse created a handsome endowment for the institution in the late Twenties. An outstanding medical school was soon established as well as the Eastman School of Music and distinguished science departments and, in the process, the small Baptist college was converted into a well-known non-sectarian university by 1940. After World War II, the University of Rochester had become the fourth most highly endowed private university in the country and it enjoyed a growing reputation in the humanities and social sciences. Although the University provided service to the citizens of Rochester - particularly through its Medical Center and Eastman School of Music - its thrust was towards national distinction as a research and scholarly institution. I think it is fair to say that at the time I left, the University of Rochester - in terms of the limited aspirations for community service that it entertained, the student clientele it sought to attract, and the kinds of research and scholarly activities that it supported - did not qualify as an institution of higher education with a humanistic mission, at least in the sense that I use this term. This is not a criticism but merely a statement of fact that is understandable

17

in view of the isolated location of the campus and the private character of the institution.

On the other hand, City College - because of its public origin, its history and its location in the midst of the largest and most cosmopolitan city of the United States - embraced a humanistic mission from its very inception. Indeed, City College had no other choice; it was founded in 1847 as the first free municipal institution of higher education in the United States, in order to serve the children of the burgeoning working class in New York City. The humanistic mission of the College was defined clearly by its first president, Horace Webster, when he said:

> "The experiment is to be tried, whether the highest education can be given to the masses, whether the children of the people - the children of the whole people - can be educated; and whether an institution of learning of the highest grade can be successfully controlled by the privileged many, not by the privileged few".

For over a century, City College discharged its humanistic mission with rare distinction and consummate sensitivity. As immigrants and workers generally were attracted to a rapidly growing New York, so did City College offer their children an education suitable to their backgrounds, their hopes, their professional and cultural aspirations. It accepted the economically and socially disadvantaged students from New York City with whatever training they received in the public high schools - subject only to the constraints of space - and, through rigorous curricula, provided the graduates with the intellectual training, professional skills and academic credentials that enabled them to climb quickly up the ladder of social mobility and post-graduate achievement.

Perhaps no one has better expressed the nature of the City College experience through World War II than Yip Harburg, a 1918 alumnus, who said on a television program in 1963:

> "As I look back I am struck by the knowledge that City College served as a unique bridge between the people who came from the Old World and the America that was in the process of being built. And I think that no other college - the Harvards, Yales and so-called Ivy League Schools -- has that particular climate for that kind of person, the person who is trying to make an adjustment in America. The teachers at City College were aware of this need and reacted to their students accordingly. I might say that my language became the English language because of people like Professor William Bradley Otis. I also learned about economic problems and social problems from the teachers. But they weren't intellectual exercises as at other colleges. You lived in those social conditions and you lived in those economic conditions; that is the great heritage of City College. I think it continues to persist because it still must serve as the gathering place for people from lower echelons of the economic and social system. That is what makes it a unique college, a democratic college."

With the end of World War II, several developments on both the national and city levels, becoming increasingly urgent in the Sixties, produced severe strains on the historic humanistic mission of City College. The first development derived from the rapid changes in the demography of New York City itself - with large numbers of Blacks and Puerto Ricans entering the City and settling in the very neighborhoods that the rising and departing White middle classes were abandoning. The second important development was that there was a rapid deterioration in the quality of New York City's public school system so that academic disadvantagement became closely correlated with economic and social disadvantagement (a correlation which was not so close in earlier decades). A third factor was that the socio-economic conditions in the inner city have always been unconducive to proper study habits and have placed inordinate work burdens on the young people. All of these developments took place at a time when hundreds of Black and Puerto Rican high school students became keenly aware that a college education (which meant almost by definition a "public college" education) could offer tickets out of the ghetto, out of inequality, out of truncated futures.

As the Sixties unfolded, student unrest became prevalent throughout the City University (CUNY). Intensified by the assasination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1968, this unrest finally erupted in the Black and Puerto Rican occupation of the South Campus of City College in the Spring of 1969. The South Campus takeover and the subsequent intrusion in College affairs by local politicians caused the resignation of the much-respected Seventh President of City College, Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, in May 1969. The takeover led to the introduction of Open Admissions into the entire CUNY system by September 1970 (a full five years before the Open Admissions Policy was scheduled to go into effect) signalling the urgent need to update the humanistic mission of City College. For me, City College, plagued by ethnic tensions, urban politics, and loud debates about its great - truly great - calling to help its city, was the place central to all our American dreams and foibles, and worthy of my fully-awakened personal commitments.

Perhaps some sense of the prevailing atmosphere at the time when I accepted appointment as City College president will be conveyed by two brief quotes from an article in The New York Times and an editorial in the Rochester Democratic and Chronicle shortly after my appointment was announced. In the article in The New York Times (dated February 28, 1970), I am quoted as saying:

> "I can think of no institution of higher learning with more potential for making a positive impact upon its environment than City College".

The article goes on to say that I advocated:

> "strong student and faculty participation in campus decision-making, upgraded graduate studies and programs of assistance by students and professors in Harlem aimed at social improvement".

The editorial in the Democrat and Chronicle (dated March 2, 1970) is entitled "Dr. Marshak Accepts Stiff Challenge" and goes on to say, among other things, that:

> "He's convinced, for example, that students and faculty should participate substantially in university decision-making; he's a great believer in the power of persuasion; and it's his feeling that "if one keeps channels open and works hard, disruptions can be avoided..." It's important that Marshak should have his chance, and that he should succeed...the nation needs every new approach that can be taken toward the difficult problem of maintaining peace on the campus...No scientist with the international reputation that Marshak enjoys is obliged to enter the campus arena - unless his convictions run so deep that he is impelled to take up the challenge. Obviously this is the way Marshak feels about his switch, and it only remains to wish him well in what may be his toughest assignment."

The City College presidency was indeed my "toughest assignment"! During my years of service as the Eighth President, I was constantly amazed by the institution's ability to survive in the face of adversity, its ability to overcome seemingly insuperable obstacles, its continuing growth and transformation and its marvelous record of academic achievement against dismaying odds. I began to understand in a profound sense the importance of City College not only in the scheme of New York City higher education but its model role in American higher education as well. I should like to share this discovery with a wider audience through this "valedictory" report to which I have given the title: "Academic Renewal in the Seventies: Memoirs of a City College President".

These "memoirs", brought together before my full return to the "contemplative" life of science after nine years in the City College presidency, attempt to explain why City College's unique contribution to American higher education lies in its constantly renewed willingness to reformulate its humanistic mission within the framework of an ever-changing metropolis called New York City. They do not constitute a detailed historical account of my tenure as City College president for the first nine years of the Seventies. For many faculty, the fiscal crisis of New York City leading to a drastic reduction in the tax-levy budget of the College and the retrenchment of all-too-many colleagues would loom as the chief event of the Seventies. For many students, the surrender of the 129 year-old tradition of free tuition at the College would mark a watershed. For many alumni, Open Admissions and the biomedical suit would highlight the City College of the Seventies. However, while I shall deal with all these troublesome problems, my choice of title is intended to convey some sense of the constant striving of my administration to see the positive thread in that turbulent decade and to strengthen and widen that thread while extending it into the future. The reader will have to judge the success of these efforts.

These memoirs are divided into eight chapters. Chapter 1, "The College's Humanistic Mission in a Changing City", sketches the degree of success with which the College implemented its humanistic mission in an ever-changing city from its founding in 1847 to the onset of Open Admissions in September, 1970. A major event in the history of City College was the establishment of the City University of New York (CUNY) in 1961 - with a graduate center, senior colleges (of which City College was considered to be the "Flagship" institution), and community colleges, all operating on an equal basis within the same system. The rapid growth of CUNY, accelerated by the opening of several more senior and community colleges in the late Sixties as a result of political and ethnic pressures, added new complications to the operation of City College during the Seventies. However, the event that had the greatest impact on the College's future during the decade of the Seventies was the Black and Puerto Rican occupation of the South Campus in the Spring of 1969. The immediate and far-reaching consequences of this major crisis are discussed in Chapter 1.

Chapter 2 is entitled "From the Five Demands to the Urban Educational Model". The 1969 Black and Puerto Rican takeover was accompanied by the issuance of Five Demands. These Five Demands are analyzed from the point of view of their implications for the reformulation of the humanistic mission of City College during the Seventies. The range of academic potential inherent in the multi-ethnic student body at City College was not fully understood when the Five Demands were announced. A reassessment led to the Urban Educational Model whose three goals defined the content of the humanistic mission of City College for the Seventies.

Chapters 3 to 7 consider in more detail each of the goals of the Urban Educational Model (UEM). Chapter 3, "Open Access, Open Admissions and Open Warfare", deals with Goal 1 of UEM. Chapters 4 and 5 respectively entitled "Liberal Arts in an Urban Environment" and "Ethnicity, Ethnic Studies and the Third World", treat the liberal arts part of Goal 2 of UEM. Chapter 6, entitled "Training Tomorrow's Professional Leaders and Affirmative Action" focuses on the professional studies part of Goal 2 of UEM. Finally, Chapter 7, entitled "Community Outreach of an Urban College" is devoted to Goal 3 of UEM. Summaries of these five chapters are given at the end of Chapter 2.

Chapter 8 calls attention to the practical needs that had to be met - with respect to physical facilities and financial resources - in order to ensure the realization of the contemporary humanistic mission of City College during the decade of the Seventies. This leads to some remarks concerning my actual experience with the vagaries of physical master-planning and funding in the public sector. The role of the UEM in creating the possibility of a Development Campaign at an urban public institution of higher education such as City College is then described.

Chapter 1

The College's Humanistic Mission in a Changing City

These memoirs begin on February 27, 1970 when the Board of Higher Education of the City University of New York officially appointed me as the eighth president of City College, effective September 1, 1970. Before this date, my contacts with the College had been brief and superficial. I had, in fact, enrolled in City College as a freshman student in February 1932, thirty-eight years before I became its president, staying only one semester before a scholarship made it possible for me to attend Columbia College, located a half-mile south along Amsterdam Avenue in upper Manhattan.

My next contact occurred when, sometime in 1935, I invited City College's distinguished faculty member, Morris Raphael Cohen, to address the undergraduate Philosophy Club at Columbia, a group that I had organized in my days as a philosophy major. Professor Cohen, spoke on the "Philosophy of Law" to the standing-room only audience one would have anticipated. During the Summer of 1940, I taught a physics course at CCNY, earning $300 to supplement my annual academic salary of $1800; the extra salary was earmarked for a second-hand car that I needed in connection with my duties at the University of Rochester where I held an appointment as an Instructor.

These contracts were scarcely sufficient to provide first-hand background information helpful for an understanding of what transpired during the nine years of my presidency. I have therefore prepared this brief chapter - by no means an historical analysis of the College's past - using various existing published accounts, file records and newspaper accounts to help place the later chapters of these memoirs into perspective.

The first section of this chapter, "The First Century," owes much to the official history of the College written by S. Willis Rudy, The College of the City of New York: A History 1847-1947. The following sections use official files and accounts and news accounts as their source.

§1 The First Century

At the time City College was founded in 1847, New York City already had more than one-half million inhabitants and was beginning to feel the impact of its thousands of foreign immigrants, as well as rising pressures for education from its working classes. As early as 1829, the platform of the Working Men's Party called for universal education. Yet, in the Fall of 1846, there were only two colleges, at Columbia and New York Universities, together enrolling approximately 250 students. Townsend Harris, whose diplomatic career was to insure him fame, was then the head of the New York City Board of Education and it was he who battled the foes of public higher education in order to bring that "greatest blessing...next to life and liberty," the blessing of education to the children of the workers and the poor. Opponents of the Free Academy argued that the creation of a free public college would be:

> "onerous to the City's finances, injurious to institutions of learning already established, the fruitful source of strife among different classes and religious sects, and almost useless for all purposes of good ..."

Mr. Harris' committee to study the establishment of a free academy, ended by circumscribing the mission of what was to become the City College, either in response to its opponents, or in an unconscious acting out of class bias. To forestall any competition between the Free Academy and several major programs at Columbia and New York Universities, as well as two seminary schools, the Free Academy was given this mission:

> "...while, it shall be in no way inferior to any of our colleges in the character, amount, or value of the information given to the pupils; the courses of studies to be pursued will have more especial reference to the active duties of operative life, rather than those more particularly regarded as necessary for the Pulpit, Bar, or the Medical Profession. Another important feature in the proposed plan is, that the laboring class of our fellow citizens may have the opportunity of giving to their children an education that will more effectively fit them for the various departments of labor and toil by which they will earn their bread. Such an institution where Chemistry, Mechanics, Architecture, Navagation, Physical as well as Moral or Mental Science, are thoroughly and practically taught, would soon raise up a class of mechanics and artists well skilled in their several pursuits..."

These words set a pattern for the future. The children of the working classes who could not afford to attend the private colleges and seminaries were not to be prepared for the legal or medical professions, or for the Pulpit.

In its first sixty years, City College primarily attracted the native-born sons of the middle and merchant classes. The few sons of poor workers who entered the Academy often dropped out for lack of money. The New York Times called editorially for scholarships, writing in 1856,

> "You might as well lock the doors of the building in Twenty-Third Street and then invite all to enter freely, as to leave them open and ask those to come who are unable to remain there."

In 1863, City's alumni produced half the lawyers, twice the businessmen and three times as many educators as Columbia University, but by the late nineteenth century, the alumni had shifted to law and medicine and only about one-third elected business careers (ten to thirty percent became teachers).

At about the turn of the century, the composition of the student body changed and the College began to enroll large numbers of Russian and other Eastern European Jews. At that time, 76 percent of New York City's population were either foreign-born or the children of foreign-born. The hardships of their lives and their language difficulties -- among other causes -- quickly thinned their ranks by the time of graduation. The Class of 1911, for example, which was 75% Jewish, graduated only 15% of its members.

Along with other New York institutions, the College migrated north at the turn of the Century in search for space and quiet, purchasing land at 138th Street and Convent Avenue in Manhattan's Harlem area in 1897, and moving there onto a new campus a decade later. As of 1902, 30,000 students had been admitted to the College but only 2730 had completed work for the degree. While the public institutions of the Middle-West were transformed into great universities with medical schools, law schools and other post-baccalaureate graduate and professional schools, City College continued to concentrate on fairly conservative undergraduate liberal arts programs that expanded only modestly in 1919, and again in 1921, when the Schools of Business (later Baruch), Technology and Education were established.

The Great Depression of the Thirties, space shortages and the Jewish quota in the Ivy League schools (which I personally witnessed) placed an extraordinary demand on admission to City College. If it is recalled that Brooklyn College was not established until 1930 and Queens

College not until 1937 (Hunter did not admit male students), one can readily understand how the limitations of physical space promoted stiff requirements for graduation and gradually pushed up the minimum high school average required for admission. This combination of circumstances after the First World War gave rise to one of the great myths of City, the myth that CCNY students were throughout its history an extraordinary and elite student body who had been admitted on the basis of high academic credentials. Contributing to this myth was the graduation during the Thirties of four men who later became Nobel Laureates (the fifth CCNY Laureate was graduated in 1954).

The enrollment bulge of the post World-War II period continued City's identification as an elite institution (although the G.I. Bill cost City graduates like Henry Kissinger and Patrick Moynihan, both of whom had begun their undergraduate work there). Federal highway policy helped fuel the exodus from New York City of many middle class persons who were now able to purchase their own homes. As the White middle class moved to Levittowns on Long Island and New Jersey, Blacks from the South and Puerto Ricans from their native island, equally determined to rise in economic and social status, came to take their places in Manhattan and the Bronx. Here were the so-called "new immigrants" whose lives, like those of generations before them, should have been enhanced by free, public education. Some statistics tell what happened.

The City College alumni office has been able to identify no more than 41 Black graduates for the decade 1930-39; 113 in the decade 1940-49; and 165 in the years 1950-54. The set of conditions that prevailed for the immigrant Class of 1911 did not exist for the new minority populations of New York who were not workers arriving with "hope in America," but the children of slaves and of a people escaping from island poverty.

§2 The Creation of City University

As the decade and the year 1960 began, the Municipal College System of New York (as CUNY was then called) had opened the previous September with rising enrollments at its "four old senior colleges", City, Hunter, Brooklyn and Queens, and at its new community colleges, Staten Island, Bronx and Queensborough. Governed by a Board appointed by New York City's Mayor, the System since 1955 had considered hiring a Chancellor, and, in 1959, the Board began to search among a national roster of applicants that included Dr. Buell Gallagher, Seventh President of the System's "Flagship," the City College of New York.

President Gallagher did not get the job and on September 1, 1960, Dr. John Everett assumed office as the first Chancellor. Soon after, in December 1960, the BHE released a report from its "Committee to Look to the Future." This document, which the Board adopted, recommended that the name of the College of the City of New York be changed to indicate university status and to enable the proposed university to offer doctoral programs and award doctoral degrees. The resolution adopted by the Board also supported tuition-free undergraduate education. On April 11, 1961, Governor Rockefeller signed into law a bill creating the City University of New York. This same bill eliminated the legislative mandate for free tuition, leaving this thorny issue to the Board of Higher Education. Rockefeller said that the new law:

"gives recognition both to the necessity for a comprehensive university structure in the city and to the aspirations of the people of the city for such an institution."

(I will discuss elsewhere the failure of CUNY to create such a comprehensive system of public higher education tied to the needs of New York City.)

With great pomp and ceremony, the young City University inaugurated its first Chancellor, on April 24, 1961, in the Great Hall of City College before an audience that included 400 dignitaries from the world-wide community of universities and learned and scholarly societies. Chancellor Everett's euphoria must have begun to evaporate in his first skirmishes with the New York City Planning Commission which refused to allocate most of the funds requested by the University for capital construction and for its doctoral programs. Citing the slow growth of the doctoral programs and the fact that he had no authority over CUNY's presidents, John Everett resigned forthwith.

Shortly before Everett's resignation, Mary Ingraham, a member of the BHE, had been charged to submit "A Long Range Plan for CUNY." With the assistance of Dr. Thomas Holy, a specialist in higher education planning who had prepared plans for both the states of Ohio and California, Mrs. Ingraham in September, 1962 turned over a remarkable document to the Board. Its theme was expansion: more buildings, more students, more faculty, more facilities. The Holy Plan, as it became know, projected a rise in enrollment from 99,825 that year to 160,000 students in 1975. It called for $400 million in capital improvements to be made during that period of time. Under the Plan, CUNY would admit to its senior colleges the top 30% instead of the top 20% of eligible high school graduates, and it further recommended that one-third of all high school graduates in the City be accomodated by the community colleges. Other recommendations made in this Plan were the expansion of masters' programs and the establishment of a central graduate facility.

From the perspective of this book, the concerns in the Holy Plan with the rising socio-economic level of the students in the senior college are most important. Noting that "the new immigrant populations are not able to compete for admission to the four-year colleges," the Plan called for the opening of two new community colleges that were to be located in Brooklyn. (The Plan's underlying assumptions seemed to be that by lowering entrance requirements to a GPA of 82 or 83%, and by expanding the two-year colleges, the political and educational embarrassment of White, elite senior colleges in New York City could be overcome.)

The Plan and the Board failed to analyze the differences between these "new immigrants" and the Class of 1911. Nor did they fully appreciate the severe deterioration of the public school system that fed the colleges. The Board also exhibited a naive belief that the private universities and colleges in the City and State would watch with indifference the expansion of City University into doctoral work and professional education, as well as into many new physical units that would take away larger percentages of the local high school pool of students. If one were to write the history of the struggle of the private and public colleges in the State, the decade of the Sixties would certainly be marked as a period in which the political war between the "publics" and "privates" became more intense, more open and more direct.

CUNY's late entry into the doctoral field was hampered not only by the City's reluctance to fund these expensive programs (a reluctance surely encouraged by the private universities), but by the jealousies and competition that existed among CUNY's senior colleges. An arrangement was finally worked out among them whereby laboratory-based disciplines would have essentially all the doctoral work done on the campuses (thus opening up an entire range of possibilities for City College in connection with its science, engineering and clinical psychology programs) and the other disciplines housed in a graduate facility (the Graduate Center at 42 Street).

The Holy Plan and the Board also failed to recognize that CUNY had to distinguish its mission from that of the private sector if it was not to be attacked as too duplicative of what already existed in New York City's private universities who saw CUNY threatening their own plans for expansion and national status. CUNY, unfortunately, missed this chance to position itself as a "non-traditional" graduate institution by establishing urban-related interdisciplinary doctoral programs (along the lines of the Middle State Evaluation Report and Clark Kerr's speech discussed in Chapter 2). If CUNY had established a major university center for urban problems or proposed a research institute (like the Rand Institute), these would have provided the rationale to develop a graduate school that in part, at least, would have been clearly differentiated from those in the private universities. More importantly, the University would have created a fiscal and political rationale for its expansion that might have headed off the trade-offs that it was forced to make in the Sixties, as a result of which numbers pressures for "open access" were exploited in order to secure funding for its expansion into doctoral programs.

§3 Institutional Constraints on City College

Before concluding this Chapter with a review of the events precipitating the occupation of the South Campus, the resignation of Buell Gallagher as President and the advent of Open Admissions, I should like to briefly note that university status in and of itself added yet another layer to the constraints upon each college president to develop and implement policies independently of 'CUNY Central' or '80th Street' as the CUNY administration was variously known.

In a record of its own actions from 1926 to 1943, the Board notes:

> "The definitive history of the Board and the municipal college system, when written, will show clearly the difficulties experienced by a lay board of trustees in dealing with the ethnic diversities and expectations of the great metropolis of New York. Perhaps the greatest difficulty such a history will analyze is the delicate manner in which the Board has had to be politically responsive without becoming politically servile."

Political instrusions into education, whether overt or covert, always affect public institutions. In the case of City University, its close proximity to the body politic of the City and its total dependence on an annual appropriation from the City and the State also made it vulnerable to political suggestion and inuendo as much as to the politicians' own attempts to satisfy their constituents.

While these larger political forces could be seen at work on a day-to-day basis, in the resignation of Buell Gallagher, in the location of York College, in the funding of SEEK, and in the quick decision to advance the implementation of Open Admissions five years earlier than planned, other institutional constraints from CUNY made the presidential job difficult. For years, President Gallagher had fought for the decentralization of graduate programs. CUNY's centralized system, he fumed,

> "is leading the undergraduate colleges to increasing frustration, their faculties to mediocrity in recruitment and in retention, and their students to a second-rate opportunity."

While these dire predictions did not all materialize, it is true that each college suffered budgetarily from the complicated fiscal arrangement it had to make in releasing its faculty to the Graduate Center and for charges made against it for graduate education.

The budgetary allocations to the colleges, in which colleges were compensated on an enrollment-driven basis, made no sense for the differential costs of graduate and professional education. Yet, CUNY dragged these budgetary chains behind it into the Seventies and had to convince the State each year that it cost more to train engineers than it cost to train language teachers. If enrollment determined college budgets, then one might have expected each college to be vigorous in attracting and keeping its student constituency, based on its own standards and programs. But, again, this was not the case. Each student applied not to a college, but to CUNY and, in turn, students were "allocated" to the Colleges by the CUNY computer. CUNY could - and did - institute changes in retention standards (such as the Skills Assessments Test), in financial aid packaging, in admissions requirements, and so on.

These changes and moves to centralize and standardize what had been fairly independent and strong colleges came about in the Sixties. Coming from a private university, I was not accustomed to so many layers of authority between me and decisions. My first bitter experience involved the CUNY allocation of Open Admissions students to City College. In my first year as president, I argued over and over again with CUNY central, with the other presidents, and with members of the Board, trying to convince them that CUNY, and not just City College, must share equally in the task of meeting the challenge of New York City's underprepared students.

I argued without success for a university policy that would implement Open Admissions on a city-wide basis. The political realities formed an admissions system that allowed each student to select the CUNY college of his or her choice. However, this was educationally unsound. Overloading City College with remedial responsibilities did not allow its faculty sufficient time to redesign instructional strategies to properly meet the needs of large numbers of underprepared students. I tried to reason that the university's refusal to spread the allocation of Open Admissions students more equitably around the university would, in the long run, adversely affect the reputation of the entire University. If City College suffered exaggerated effects of Open Admissions, then the entire policy and the academic credibility of CUNY would be affected. In vain, City College was compelled to mount extensive and expensive remedial programs or face a loss in funding by rejecting students.

Because City College was really a "mini-University" (a College of liberal arts and science and at first four and then five professional schools) with its greatest strengths in science and engineering - it faced special problems with its budget. City recieved on the average only slightly more dollars per credit-student than the primarily liberal arts colleges, like Queens and Brooklyn. City College, thus labored under a great disadvantage. Again, I spent fruitless days and nights and endless trips to CUNY headquarters and to Albany pleading for reasonable differentiation in the funding of City College's professional schools and the Science Division of its College of Liberal Arts and Science but this, too, was never really accepted.

During the terrible fiscal crisis in New York City in 1975-76, the full force of this inequity hit City College as each of CUNY's units had sharply to reduce its budget expenditures. During that period, some 3000 people lost their jobs in CUNY and at City College. These cuts virtually wiped out City College's student support services, security budgets, equipment budgets and library funds in order to maintain the College's expensive, yet valuable professional schools and Science Division. The fiscal crisis also shattered the 129-year long tradition of free tuition for young New Yorkers desiring to avail themselves of a college education. The imposition of tuition equal in amount to that of SUNY (but without the numerous amenities available to students in the multi-billion dollar physical plant of the SUNY system) led to a drastic decline in the enrollments of most of the CUNY colleges (including City) with the exception of business-oriented Baruch College and certain career-specialized CUNY community colleges.

§4 Prelude to the South Campus Occupation

The Board of Higher Education's failure to understand entirely the new realities of urban life in New York, while critical, in no way diminished its accomplishments. At that time, there were few minority voices at Board headquarters, nor were many minority students or faculty on the campuses. In this milieu, CUNY's second Chancellor, Dr. Albert Bowker, became a powerful influence on the future course of higher education in New York. By the Fall of 1963, Chancellor Bowker called for a rollback in admissions average and a freshman class of 15,000 students as CUNY officials cited "urgent pressures" being created by the growing number of applicants to the young university. He pointed to estimates that there would be 10,000 more high school graduates in New York City in 1964 than in 1963 and urged funds to support an enrollment of 102,000 students in CUNY. CUNY indicated that admissions standards could return to those of a decade back, when averages of 82-83% were used; if not, officials warned, high school averages required by the senior colleges could go as high as 90% in 1964. At City, President Gallagher told the Faculty they must expand the college's enrollment or risk becoming "an exclusive college catering to the academic elite." Most of those who would be hurt, he said, would be "Negroes and Puerto Ricans."

By early 1964, the BHE announced two experimental programs designed to bring more minority students into the University. Five hundred "special matriculants" would be selected, the announcement said. In addition, five university "development centers" were to be established in New York City high schools. In these five centers, selected minority students would be given the skills training to help them pass CUNY's entrance requirements.

In March, 1964, a 95-page Master Plan for CUNY was unveiled. This Plan proposed for the four-year period 1964-1968:

> 1) a 65% overall increase in enrollment; 2) an increase in senior college enrollment from 36,000 to 52,800; 3) an enrollment increase in the two-year colleges from 2800 to 10,500.

Showing a changed awareness, the Master Plan proposed to utilize the expertise of faculty researchers "to get at the roots of the problems of urban education." Extra funds were also requested for the additional preparation needed for teachers of the disadvantaged. Fifty or sixty new "career options" were forecast as part of the community college curricula. The outlook for graduate education remained uncertain, for no funds had been allocated to develop masters or doctoral level work. But the overriding limitation on the growth of CUNY and its chief weakness, according to Bowker, was its need for physical plant development, to cost at least $200 million by 1968. Within a month of its release, the Master Plan was blasted by several faculty members at a hearing held at Hunter College because of its emphasis on numbers of students rather than on quality. Faculty complained that such a rapid growth made it difficult to take the time needed to recruit new good staff. And the Master Plan, faculty speakers charged, failed to consider programs that would admit disadvantaged students "without compromising quality education."

Across the continent, on the Berkeley campus of the University of California, 3500 students demonstrated that October in protest over Chancellor Clark Kerr's directives to bar distribution on campus grounds of "direct persuasive political materials" or the "soliciting of funds for political purposes." A heterogeneous and unlikely collection of student groups - CORE, SNCC, the Young Socialists, the Young Republicans and the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists - had systematically been violating the regulation. As police attempted to remove or arrest a sometime graduate student at CORE's table, thousands of angry students surrounded and shook the police car. Continued protests led in December to the arrest of 800 Berkeley students. A shocked faculty voted overwhelmingly to ask the Berkeley Central Administration to turn over all dealings with the students to them. Many voices blamed the conservative State Senate for pressuring Kerr not to give in to the students' original demands. Others charged that the Free Speech Movement (the name the protesters had adopted) was communistic. Kerr, under fire, said;

> "they (the students) have asked that they be subject only to external law and external courts. They are learning that the community is no more sympathetic with anarchy than the university they so violently condemn."

In New York, Chancellor Bowker, speaking to members of thirty civil rights and civic organizations, told them that CUNY would like to accommodate the top quarter of all high school graduates and return to an 82% entering average for freshmen. This had been the average required, he reminded them, in 1957. But, in 1965, the fiscal woes of New York City multiplied. Who noticed? Certainly not the thousands of students crowded onto the campuses of CUNY in September. Motivated by the draft, trusting in statistics that proved that college graduates earn more money than high school graduates, urged on by parents, driven by a need to climb out of the ghetto, they crowded the classrooms, libraries, laboratories of every CUNY unit providing literally hundreds of jobs for new Ph.D.'s in every conceivable field (a boom for the CUNY departments whose offers carried rapidly rising pay scales and a myriad of benefits, as a result of the unionization of the faculty). Despite incredibly poor physical conditions -- students on one campus attended classes in rented buses - an aura of excitement and well-being infused most of the students and staff.

To its credit, the BHE fretted, if ineffectually, about the low numbers of minority students in CUNY. The spector of a high school population rising in its minority percentages, while CUNY's senior colleges maintained White, middle-class majorities (some as high as 90%) remained. Finally, in April, 1966, a revised Master Plan did propose to admit 25% of the high school graduates. However, because of the usual insufficiency of funds, CUNY cut back freshmen to 2500, admitting its smallest freshman class in years in the Fall of 1966. A last ditch effort squeezed 2,000 more freshmen into rented quarters and into CUNY college centers. Richmond College, an upper division school, opened on Staten island. Gustave Rosenberg stepped aside from the BHE Chair to head the CUNY Construction Fund, established in a vain hope to speed up capital projects. Rosenberg was replaced by the prominent attorney, Porter R. Chandler, as BHE Chairman. The prime goal of the BHE, Chandler said, was to expand our facilities "so that we can take care, as quickly as possible, of the people who are clamoring at our doors." The underprivileged, he added, "have to be brought along so that they will have a better chance of passing the entrance exams."

At CCNY, expansion mandated the construction of temporary, prefab buildings (still, unhappily, conspicuous on campus as of 1980) and students protested these as well as the College's Physical Master Plan that called for the demolition of Lewisohn Stadium and an athletic area known as Jasper Oval. The Physical Master Plan being created at City would transform the College by the Eighties. The first new building to be constructed was the 14-story Science Building, over

41

Jasper Oval, reflecting CCNY's vigorous reputation in the sciences. Other renovations and new buildings, scheduled originally for completion by 1977, promised to give City College one of the best urban campuses in the entire Northeast.

Some programmatic advances also showed promise. In 1965, the College had established the Pre-Baccalaureate program, in which chiefly Black and Puerto Rican students from low income ghetto families enrolled in special remedial programs on campus that prepared them for entrance into regular college work; the students were also given stipends for attending. By the Summer of 1965, the innovative "Pre-Bac" program at City College became part of a State-wide SEEK program (Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge). The legislation that created SEEK was put together by CUNY leadership in concert with a small but determined caucus of Black and Puerto Rican legislators who had challenged CUNY's use of public funds for colleges that enrolled so few minority students. The mandate for SEEK was taken almost verbatim from the City College experiment which seemed to be working, although only one year in development. The legislators, temporarily mollified, released CUNY's funds, and put up $5 million to open this doorway into the senior colleges for New York City's academically deprived minorities.

Decisions pressed in on the BHE during the 1966-67 year. The location for "Alpha" College (York), a senior-level college for the Brooklyn-Queens population, became the subject of heated hearings and shouting matches between Whites and Blacks. Plans flowed from the pens of CUNY-BHE dreamers: a variety of specialized schools would open; there would be an engineering research laboratory; faculty housing; a nursing facility; a health careers unit; an upper division college to prepare teachers of the disadvantaged; a health-related college near Flower-Fifth Avenue Hospital. A Harlem community college would link community service to the special needs of the area; preference for admission would be given to graduates of local high schools, based on a "deprivation index"; the University would cooperate with the City to enable every student to profit from education beyond high school; an "open enrollment" method would admit local students on a first-come, first-served basis; CUNY would build dormitories. Although CUNY planners foresaw a 50% drop in freshman enrollment by 1975, they envisioned that the total enrollment in the University would be bolstered by a tripling of SEEK students, higher numbers of transfers from the community colleges, and the attraction of a university-wide Department of International Studies as well as higher graduate enrollments.

In April 1968, Martin Luther King, Jr. was shot as he stood on the balcony of a motel in Montgomery, Alabama. The reaction in CUNY was electric: hundreds of students milled around Gracie Mansion after a memorial service, asking to see Mayor John Lindsay and discuss Black Power and their "Sixteen Demands." They told the press that the students wanted to expand the SEEK program; proportionate the representation of Black students in CUNY to the City's population, develop Black history courses, decentralize the public schools; hire more Black teachers, and re-instate two high school teachers who had been suspended for conducting a memorial service for Malcolm X. Mayor Lindsay, it was reported, spent about twenty minutes with the student delegates, leaving them to aide Syd Davidoff. Threatening summer violence in the streets, the students reiterated their previous demands, adding Puerto Ricans to each. They gave the Mayor three pages of ultimata, adding community board control of the police, the abolition of the police tactical force, and the termination of city contracts with "racist" firms.

One month earlier, in March 1968, more than 100 student members of the Columbia University chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) had marched through the Library to protest the affiliation of the University with the Institute for Defense Analysis. An SDS rally on April 23, in response to the disciplinary actions of the University against students who took part in the Library demonstration, led to the occupation first of Hamilton Hall, and later of other buildings. Black students at Columbia quickly pressed the long-smoldering issue of Columbia's construction of a gymnasium at Morningside Drive and 114th Street and, during that same evening, groups and representatives of organizations in Harlem and other parts of the City began to join the students on campus. Rumors spread that "the Black community is taking over" and that the people from Harlem had brought guns to the campus. In two days, the Black and White students had split into distinct groups and the White students withdrew from Hamilton Hall. Repeated efforts over the next few days to reach a peaceful resolution failed. Police were called and, with great violence, cleared the buildings. Of the 692 persons arrested, 524 were Columbia students and at least 25 more were Columbia alumni. President Grayson Kirk subsequently resigned.

I have gone into some detail concerning the Columbia riots, only 15 blocks from the City College campus, in order to recall the spirit of militancy that was sweeping across the campuses of the United States (and Western Europe) in the late Sixties. The Columbia riots, it was said, were a sympton of a "profound malaise" in the West. Anthropologist Margaret Mead said this was the end of universities treating students "like babies." Richard Nixon warned that Columbia University's takeover was "the first skirmish in a revolutionary struggle to seize universities in the United States and transform them into sanctuaries for radicals and into vehicles for revolutionary political and social goals."

On August 3, 1968, Chancellor Bowker outlined a "revolutionary" CUNY admissions program that would increase the numbers of Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the CUNY schools, even those with averages as low as 68%. The program would guarantee admission to the top 100 graduates in sixty New York City high schools. Its aim, Bowker said, was to enroll a class that was composed of 26% minority students. CUNY also proposed that it, and not the Board of Education, take over the operation of five disadvantaged high schools in the City. At the time, enrollment in CUNY was 13% Black and Puerto Rican.

As 1969 began, the Regents gave their approval to the CUNY plan to enroll all high school graduates by 1975. Ten Black and Jewish leaders, the Temporary Commission on Black-Jewish relations, warned that budget cuts and admissions cuts in CUNY "threaten new confrontations between racial and religious groups because of the intense struggle by disadvantaged groups to gain higher education." Bowker expressed concern that the tensions between Blacks and Jews might explode and he told news reporters that CUNY had received hundreds of calls urging admissions cuts in ghetto programs. The American Jewish Congress charged Bowker with "fomenting racial and religious tension by predicting it."

On April 22, 1969, the gates of the South Campus at City College were chained shut by approximately 100 Black and Puerto Rican students who put forth five "non-negotiable" demands. In substance, these demands distilled the sixteen demands that had been carried up the lawn of Gracie Mansion to the Mayor the year before and that had also previously been presented to other CUNY college presidents. The Five Demands called for a large increase in the number of minority students admitted to City College and an acknowledged injection of "ethnicity" into the college curriculum through the creation of a separate school of Black and Puerto Rican Studies. President Gallagher took the demands seriously, as did the Faculty Senate, which voted to ask Dr. Gallagher and the Board to keep the College closed in order to continue its negotiations. An account in the City College ALUMNUS (October 1969) by Tom Ackerman reported:

> "In the evening the Board's committee met to give its answer: no. First the Board members told faculty representatives, they were under legal writ to remain open permanently. Moreover, the Board was under terrific political pressure. Threats of budget cuts in the City Council had been openly voiced the previous week. Moreover, many Board members sincerely felt that to close the school again, even temporarily, would be a surrender to coercion. Talk of relieving the Board of its duties entirely and the prospect of a 'McCarthy-type investigation' further influenced its decision."

On Friday morning, May 9, 1969, Buell Gallagher requested that his resignation become effective the following Monday.

Chapter 2

From the Five Demands to the Urban Educational Model

§1 The Meaning of the Five Demands

It has already been pointed out that the student unrest which overtook many campuses in the United States in the late Sixties was fanned by growing opposition to the disastrous Viet Nam War. So widespread and so deep was the anti-Viet Nam movement - under predominantly White leadership - that it led to a questioning of the basic values and norms of American institutions in general, and the higher educational enterprise in particular. At the same time, the Civil Rights Movement - under predominantly Black leadership - which had received great impetus from the Supreme Court decision of 1954 (mandating desegregation in education) and was running a fairly independent course of its own, attempted to eliminate all perceived manifestations of institutional racism in the United States, including college and university campuses. With Blacks as the dominant minority in the Sixties, it is not surprising that they provided the leadership for change in the structure and practices of American higher education at those "White" campuses that they were attending in significant numbers. With the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1968, coming as it did when the opposition to the Viet Nam War was peaking (let us recall that President Lyndon Johnson withdrew from the presidential race at about that time), campus confrontations clearly were to be expected. It is within this historical context that one must try to understand the meaning of the "non-negotiable" "Five Demands" presented to the City College administration by the Black and Puerto Rican Student Caucus at the time of its occupation of the South Campus on April 22, 1969.

Specifically, the Five Demands called for: 1) the establishment of a separate Black and Puerto Rican freshman orientation program controlled by minority upperclassmen; 2) the creation of a separate degree-granting School of Black and Puerto Rican Studies on a par with the other schools of the College; 3) the matriculation of SEEK students as regular college students and control of the SEEK program by its staff and students - this demand also included the statement that the SEEK staff of remedial teachers and counselors be granted the same status as other faculty, and that the SEEK director carry the rank of Dean; 4) the composition of the student body at City College was to reflect the ethnic makeup of the public high school system of New York City (which was 40% Black and Puerto Rican at that time); and 5) a requirement that all majors in the School of Education attain basic proficiency in Spanish and in 'Black and Puerto Rican Heritage'. It should be noted immediately that there was no reference in these Five Demands to the on-going Viet Nam War; the activist White anti-Viet Nam student groups at City College, most of whom supported the Five Demands, were not invited to participate in their formulation and, indeed, were not allowed to join in the occupation. A second point to note is that the Black student leadership of this major confrontation invited Puerto Rican "brothers and sisters" to join in the planning and implementation of the operation but not Asian students (Asian students comprised a comparable percentage of the student body as did Puerto Rican students); at first sight, this seemed to be understandable since members of the neighboring community were consulted on the takeover (and City College is located on the boundary between "Black Harlem" and "Hispanic Harlem") but, there appeared to be a deeper significance to this omission. Finally, before proceeding to analyze the meaning of the Five Demands and their resolution, I should like to comment on President Buell Gallagher's handling of the crisis.

I have always felt that it was ironic and tragic that President Gallagher's resignation was precipitated by the Black and Puerto Rican occupation of the South Campus (a resignation that created the presidential vacancy I was called upon to fill a year later). I was far from the City College campus in the Spring of 1969 - serving as Faculty Senate Chairman at the University of Rochester as described in the Preface - and therefore do not possess a first-hand knowledge of what actually happened. But from all accounts, President Gallagher made a valiant effort (regarded as misguided by some and insufficient by others) to negotiate the "non-negotiable" Five Demands. He had come to City College seventeen years earlier with a background of service as the White president of a Black college during a period when this was most unusual. He had negotiated in good faith before the days of the Henderson Act in New York State (which prohibits negotiations with students during the occupation of a campus building or office) and when he was on the verge of a possible breakthrough, his efforts collapsed under the pressures of candidates in the New York mayoralty race, one of whom sought a court injunction to open the College. The arrival of police on campus led to his resignation. His bitterness and sadness seem evident to me in the statements made at the time of his resignation:

"Men and events," he said, "have made this earlier separation necessary. The frustrations spawned by a society which has inverted its values and reversed its priorities, putting war ahead of human well-being and preferring privilege to justice - these frustrations have pushed the on-coming college generation into an activism which over-reaches immediately attainable goals. The resulting strains on the academic community are evident throughout the nation and at CCNY...My own functions as a reconciler of differences and a catalyst for constructive change have become increasingly difficult to carry out. And with the intrusion of politically motivated outside forces in recent days - it has become impossible to carry on the processes of reason and persuasion."

While I personally do not believe in "negotiation" under duress - there is a subtle distinction between "presidential mediation" and "presidential negotiation" - nor in calling the police to deal with a non-violent confrontational situation, the fact is that much of the substance of President Gallagher's "negotiated agreements" with the Black and Puerto Rican Student Caucus was reaffirmed by the BHE during the Summer of 1969 following his resignation and the appointment of Acting President Joseph Copeland.

President Gallagher and his "negotiating team", consisting of administrators and representatives of the Faculty Senate, quickly separated the Five Demands into three minor demands (Demands 1, 3 and 5) and the more difficult major demands (Demands 2 and 4). Demand 1, requesting a separate Black and Puerto Rican freshmen orientation, could easily be accommodated by adding a separate freshmen orientation program for these students to the College-wide freshman orientation activities. Since many of the Black and Puerto Rican graduates of the inner city high schools would enter City College with great expectations, special needs and unsupportive family environments, it did not seem unreasonable to augment the regular freshmen orientation program with an additional one managed by "minority upperclassmen". The Black and Puerto Rican Freshmen Orientation program could easily be monitored by a representative faculty committee (chosen, say, by the

Faculty Senate) for seriousness of academic purpose and usefulness; if it became the vehicle for political indoctrination, it would have to be discontinued.

Demand 3 could also be readily accepted without doing violence to academic standards and college governance. A SEEK department could be established (as it subsequently was at City College) as one of the departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Science. Its members could be given faculty rank for certain categories of duties (e.g. SEEK counselors and remedial social science teachers could receive the same faculty status as counselors in the Department of Student Personnel Services) while other categories of duties (e.g. remedial English and remedial Math) could be covered by instructors given faculty status (at the newly-created rank of Lecturer) in the regular departments. The SEEK Department would have to be governed by the same college regulations as the other departments but there was no reason why students could not be added to the Executive Committee of the SEEK Department as was permitted several years later for all departments (under a governance structure allowing two students to be added to the five faculty members of a departmental executive committee). (This college-wide governance structure was adopted by a faculty-student referendum as a compromise - proposed by me - between the Student Senate demand for five students on each departmental executive committee and the Faculty Senate opposition to any students on departmental executive committees). The college-wide governance plan, providing for student input into the curricular and faculty personnel decisions, moved in the direction of the SEEK Department's wishes but maintained equal treatment for all departments. Insofar as special recognition for the SEEK Department was concerned, the Director of the SEEK program with its 2,000 students at City College, rightfully acquired in later years the status of Assistant Dean by virtue of the broad range of responsibilities assigned to that office.

Demand 5, requesting that all students in the School of Education at City College become proficient in Spanish and take a course in "Black and Puerto Rican Heritage", made sense in terms of the overwhelming numbers of Black and Puerto Rican students in the public school system of New York City, and was expeditiously dealt with by the School of Education.

The disposition of Demands 2 and 4 was a much more troublesome process because it impinged on the most diverse conceptions - among students, faculty and alumni - of what the mission and purpose of an urban public college like City College should and could be a quarter of a century after the end of World War II. Chapter I recounts some of the numerous proposals and counterproposals advanced to increase the accessibility of City College and other units of CUNY to the poorly prepared high school graduates of the New York City system. Suffice to say, the specific attempts made by President Gallagher and his "negotiating team" to meet Demand 4 led not only to his resignation but left in their wake a divided faculty, a polarized student body and a troubled alumni association. The decision taken later, in the Summer of 1969, by the BHE to meet Demand 4 by inaugurating in 1970 the previous planned Open Admissions Policy scheduled for 1975, did very little to improve the strained relations among faculty, students, administrators and alumni at City College. The Open Admissions Policy commencing September 1, 1970 (the day I assumed office as Eighth President of City College), which became identified in the public mind with the major outcome of the Black and Puerto Rican student takeover in the Spring of 1969, was a watershed in the history of City College and will be discussed in detail in the next chapter under the title "Open Access, Open Admissions and Open Warfare".

The overriding attention given to Demand 4 and the clashing ideologies and emotionalism engendered by its consideration obscured the far-reaching implications of Demand 2 for the future of the College. President Gallagher had very little time to come to grips with this demand for a separate School of Black and Puerto Rican Studies and Acting President Copeland thought that he had disposed of this demand through the creation of a separate Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies in the Fall of 1969. In my view, the establishment of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies was a mistake on two counts: it did not go far enough in meeting the aspirations of the Black cultural nationalists under the leadership of Professor Wilfred Cartey (expressed in an important document entitled "School of Regional and Community Affairs" dated May 3, 1969) and it went too far in asking the new department to develop an ethnic studies program within the liberal arts framework while at the same time designing a series of urban-oriented curricula with professional overtones. I shall first discuss Cartey's blueprint for a separate School of Black and Puerto Rican Studies and then turn to the ramifications of the new

Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies.

Professor Wilfred Cartey, an Afro-Caribbean poet and literary critic, was hired from Columbia University by President Gallagher in February 1969 to plan Black and Hispanic Studies programs. By the time the Five Demands were presented by the Black and Puerto Rican Student Caucus on April 22, 1969, Demand 2 stated the need for a separate School of Black and Puerto Rican Studies, a demand that received full articulation in Cartey's memorandum issued on May 3. While Cartey's memorandum appeared too late to influence President Gallagher's negotiations with the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus, and was only implemented to a limited extent through the formation of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies, it became the intellectual foundation of much of the thinking of the faculty in the Black Studies Department in ensuing years.

The Cartey memo was entitled "School of Regional and Community Affairs". Cartey defined the terms "regional" and "community" as follows:

> "By regional we mean all those areas of the world inhabited and influenced by peoples of African descent and all regions where the culture, heritage, and traditions of these peoples have blended together with those of other people to produce a unique and distinctive pattern of life...By community we mean the Harlem community and other such communities ecologically similar."

Cartey started his memo with the statment that:

> "To truly educate a person is to teach him to move creatively within the rhythms of his land--to make him appreciate the sights, and sounds, and smells, to give him a sense of his history and culture, and to relate this history and culture to the larger world around him."

He continued with the observation that the School, whose creation he was proposing, must reflect these "rhythms" and therefore must be inter-area, interdisciplinary and interdepartmental. "The School must include Black and Latin peoples and must relate (as these people do) all areas of their lives to all others."

Cartey further urged that "the dream of 1847" (on which City College was founded):

> "be realized in 1969, 122 years later; that man must be harmonized with his environment, that education be a right, not a privilege of the human being. In 1969 City College, situated in the community of Harlem, cannot exist without its environment just as a mind cannot exist without the entire body and spirit."

It is interesting to list the areas of concentration that Cartey called upon the School to develop initially:

"1. African Studies

2. Afro-American Studies, specifically in the United States

3. Community Studies, specifically in Harlem

4. Caribbean Studies

5. Puerto Rican Studies

6. Other New World Areas, specifically Brazil"

Further, in the School of Regional and Community Affairs:

> "in addition to the traditional academic faculty qualifications, faculty will be hired on the basis of artistic creativity and/or expertise in dealing with urban community problems, etc. The qualifications of such faculty may be experimental rather than academic;...We recommend that all existing courses in the College reflective of an international, cross-cultural, or urban character include these elements as they relate to Africa, Afro-American, Puerto Rican and Caribbean peoples".

Cartey had some explicit things to say about the field work that would be required of all students enrolled in the School of Regional and Community Affairs, to wit:

"Field work may take the form of community service with a research component as one element of a course; likewise, independent field work, such as employment in a community center, should be awarded academic credit as part of a research project."

Cartey quoted with approval from John W. Gardner's book Self-Renewal:

"Vested interests constitute another problem for the aging society...In any organization, many of the established ways of doing things are held in place not by logic, nor even by habit but by the force of one powerful consideration: changing them would jeopardize the rights, privileges or advantages of specific individuals -- perhaps the president, perhaps the maintenance men. And when individuals develop vested interests, the organization itself rigidifies...In colleges many of the regulations regarding required courses which are defended on highly intellectual grounds are also powerfully buttressed by the career interests of the faculty members involved in those courses... They (vested interests) are among the most powerful forces producing rigidity and diminishing capacity for change. And these are the diseases of which organizations and societies die."

The memo by Prof. Cartey (and Ms. Christian) concluded with the statement: "We hope that by the development of this School, City College will not die; and further that the life of the community will be nourished by it".

Professor Cartey's memo contained a number of important observations but like all pioneering manifestos, it was more cogent in the analysis of some of the problems than in offering a blueprint for their solution. Some irresponsible statements about the document were made by its supporters as well as by its detractors. In a retrospective article in the Black and Puerto Rican City College newspaper, The Paper, it was stated that:

"The contents of his (Cartey) proposal were too profound to be implemented by a college which was so reactionary in purpose and so violently unreceptive to change".

On the other hand, a spokesman for the traditional City College faculty, Lloyd P. Gartner (writing in the October 1969 issue of "Midstream") argued that the School of Regional and Community Affairs would undermine "the ideals of the university as a neutral, free, non-political center of teaching and research" and move the college in the direction of a "social rather than an educational institution, commited much less to the intellectual discipline of higher education than to the effort of being "relevant" to current social trends".

The Urban Educational Model was an attempt to find a middle ground between these extreme points of view. Its formulation was influenced by two earlier documents that came to my attention (Clark Kerr's 1967 address to the City College Phi Beta Kappa Chapter and the 1966 report of the Middle States Evaluation Team) prior to my knowledge of Cartey's memo. While I sympathized with Professor Cartey's advocacy of a School of Regional and Community Affairs as a mechanism to serve the needs primarily of Black and Hispanic students and communities in New York City, I felt quite strongly that it was City College's responsibility to develop a set of innovative educational programs that would serve the needs of the College's entire multi-ethnic student body and provide service to all the ethnic communities of the metropolitan New York area.

As it turned out, the challenges, opportunities and limitations of a separate School of Black and Puerto Rican Studies (or the model proposed by Professor Cartey) were not seriously discussed by the campus community during the hectic weeks of the South Campus occupation and the aftermath of President Gallagher's resignation. Some informal polling of the faculty by Acting President Copeland at the end of the Spring 1969 semester led him to propose the establishment of a separate department of Urban and Ethnic Studies in the College of Liberal Arts and Science. This proposal was approved by the BHE and by September, a chairman, Professor Osborne Scott, was appointed. The Executive Committee of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies was also in place since, according to BHE guidelines, the Executive Committee of a new department is not elected (as it is for established departments in CUNY) but is appointed by the president. As Chairman of the Executive Committee, Dr. Copeland appointed Professor Howard Adelson, the Chairman of the History Department at City College.

§2 Genesis of the Urban Educational Model

The multiplicity of problems confronting me when I took office as City College president on September 1, 1970, left me reeling. The day that I assumed office at City College was precisely the first day that the new Open Admissions policy was inaugurated throughout the CUNY system. With the advent of Open Admissions, the clashing ideologies and emotionalism generated by the South Campus occupation were reawakened among students, faculty and alumni. To the large influx of Open Admissions students - with their unanticipated needs for heavy remediation, counseling and tutorial services - was added the largest SEEK class in CUNY (close to 2000 students with about two-thirds on campus and the remaining one-third assigned to a mid-Manhattan location called the Alamac Hotel). To the overriding problems of organizing the College to deal with the large numbers of under-prepared students, were added the unexpected problems of a grossly inadequate administrative structure at the College, the labyrinthine intricacies of securing approval for the College's Physical Master Plan, a deeply feuding History Department, a community organization (Fight Back) determined to overcome discrimination against minorities in the construction industry throughout New York City via City College, the open sale of heroin on campus, faculty and student senates wary of the administration, and so on and so forth. Some of these problems and my attempts to deal with them are discussed elsewhere in these memoirs. Here, I should like to focus on those facets of the situation that led me to pursue vigorously the articulation of an urban educational mission for City College. Perhaps the best way to explain the dilemmas that faced me and the groping steps taken to resolve them, is to remain within the context of the Five Demands.

As I think back to the atmosphere prevailing on the City College campus in the Fall of 1970, I believe that it is fairly accurate to state that while there was a great deal of grumbling and much confusion about the resolution of the "minor" Demands 1, 3 and 5, the attention of the City College community was focused on the outcome of the "major" Demands 2 and 4. The institution of Open Admission by City University in September 1970 - as its response to Demand 4 - led to a plethora of problems and a backlash of resentment but at least it represented a well-defined policy which one could endeavor to implement with all the intelligence and sensitivity that one could muster. This was not the case for the compromised resolution of Demand 4, namely the creation of a Department of Urban and Ethnic Stúdies.

When I arrived at City College in September 1970, I found the Deparment of Urban and Ethnic Studies operating with over one thousand student enrollees and with a mixed mandate: to create courses that would attempt to delineate the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of Blacks and Puerto Ricans and at the same time to design courses that would deal with problems of urban decay. This mixed mandate seemed to me to carry a double threat to the quality of the educational offerings at City College: on the one hand, the diversion of energy to develop urban programs would undermine the creation of a sound ethnic studies discipline (whose legitimacy was still not accepted in many quarters) and, on the other hand, it was unrealistic to think of assigning to the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies sufficient faculty with professional expertise to make a dent on the ills of New York City. I accepted the thesis that American urban problems are greatly exacerbated by the extra dimension of ethnicity and racial tension. But it was also true that many of the problems common to large cities throughout the world - such as substandard housing, traffic congestion, unacceptable levels of air and noise pollution - required for their solution (if any) the input from faculty expertise in architecture, engineering and other "technical" and scientific disciplines. Apart from my concern in principle about the educational viability of a Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies at City College, there was the further consideration that there was a growing dichotomy between the Black and Puerto Rican members of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies with regard to priorities and emphases. Almost by definition, one could expect that the ethnic pride and assertiveness that led to interest in ethnic studies in the first place would vitiate a harmonious merging of the Black and Puerto Rican quests for cultural identity.

For these reasons, among others, I became convinced early during my first year as President that the urban and ethnic purposes of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies had to be separated. I was persuaded, after some initial hesitation, that substantial numbers of City College students, representing many different ethnic groups, were to some degree or other, trying to retrace their ethnic and cultural roots in order to better understand their contemporary experience. It seemed to me that this search did not have to be a divisive force but could provide institutions of higher education, especially City College, with the opportunity to establish ethnic studies programs and/or departments that would lead students to a deeper appreciation of the ethnic and cultural complexities that comprise our pluralistic society. My hope was that through these programs students could be led from their immediate concerns to a keener comprehension of the commonality of human experience and the joint partnership which must be forged among all ethnic groups to combat the destructive forces in the city, the nation and the world. This point of view was basically accepted by the City College faculty and led to the creation of four ethnic studies departments (Asian, Black, Jewish and Puerto Rican) by September 1971, as well as to the abolition of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies. This simple statement hardly does justice to the controversy engendered by and the soul-searching involved in the development of ethnic studies programs at City College. A fuller account will be given in Chapter 5 under the title: "Ethnicity, Ethnic Studies and the Third World."

My early conviction that the urban mission of City College was an undertaking of such large proportions that it could not be entrusted to any single department - let alone a newly-created department like the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies - or even a separate "School of Regional and Community Affairs - obliged me to come up with a conceptual and organizational framework that would bring to bear the talents, sensibilities, and expertise of the entire City College community on the urban afflictions of metropolitan New York. In attempting to articulate the revitalization of the College to meet its "urban mission" and the needs of a new and rapidly changing student body, I had studied two valuable documents: the Report of the Middle States Evaluation Team of 1966 and an address entitled "The Urban-Grant University: A Model for the Future" delivered by Dr. Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, to the Centennial Meeting of the City College Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in 1967. These two documents preceded the Cartey memorandum by a couple of years. Perhaps, if Professor Cartey's ethnic-centered document had incorporated the urban-oriented language of the other two documents, his innovative recommendations in the areas of ethnic, urban and international studies might have been more acceptable to the City College community. Frankly, I am not too sanguine about this statement since the City College faculty, on the whole, were unresponsive to the Middle States Report in 1966 and to the Clark Kerr address in 1967.

The Middle States Evaluation Team came to the City College campus in 1966 - as it does every ten years - to pass judgement on the performance of City College as a higher educational institution and, it concluded its report with a series of questions:

> "Is City College making its thrust into the future as it might. We ask where are the educationally innovative activities? Where might we find hints of new patterns of curriculum organization? Where are the proposals or plans for new schools? Need City College wait for City University to propose and dispose? Might not City College be considering a School of Urban Studies? A School of International Studies? A School of Law? A School for the Health-related Professions? ...A college is not a university and a university is not a college. At the moment City College is really neither. City College of the future will not be City College of the last twenty-five years. Is the College aware of this? Is it preparing adequately for a transitional period and for an expanded mission and different status?"

A year later, Dr. Kerr was raising related questions before the City College community in his Phi Beta Kappa address:

> 'May I say that I went back and looked over the City College Centennial addresses of 1947. What were they on? Looking to a new century of service, they spoke of the new science, the new international order, liberalizing the liberal arts college, the problems of organized labor and of the business college. There was no mention of the ghetto. There was no mention of equality of opportunity. There was no mention of urban blight. There was no mention of the inadequacies of the school system at the primary and secondary levels. But these are precisely what the concerns of the urban-grant university, I think, should be. It should come in with its shirt sleeves rolled up.".

In a prophetic way, Dr. Kerr's comments on the underlying spirit of the City College Centennial celebration and the questions posed by the Middle States Evaluation Team - just two to three years before the occupation of the South Campus and the Cartey memo - spoke to the same perceived deficiency in the City College of post-World War II, namely a lack of academic venturesomeness and community sensitivity. The college which had been created to educate the "children of the whole people", the college whose two driving forces for over a century had been urbanization and democratization, the college whose cafeteria alcoves in the Thirties had reverberated to the animated debates of student radicals (many of whom, it is true, are now prominent neo-conservatives!) was failing to respond rapidly enough to the new urban challenges that were thrust upon it. City College apparently did not realize with sufficient clarity in the mid-Sixties that economic and social disadvantagement were closely correlated with academic disadvantagement. Dr. Kerr's Phi Beta Kappa address contained some provocative suggestions for the educational strategies that might be adopted by a public institution of higher education located in the inner city of the leading metropolis of the United States. In particular, Dr. Kerr developed the concept of the "Urban-Grant University" in his address which greatly influenced my future plans for City College.

Dr. Kerr proposed that several major urban universities willing to focus their energies on service to their urban communities, in the same sense that the land-grant colleges once served their rural communities, should be officially designated as urban-grant universities and provided with special federal funding to support their activities. Federal financial assistance on such a basis would enable selected institutions to achieve distinction as uniquely dedicated and qualified to serve their urban communities through special educational programs, research, and community service projects. Already mentioned was Dr. Kerr's stress on the need to educate the new underprivileged, urban youth through an 'open door' policy and to press into service the urban university to grapple with the pressing problems of the cities.

Clark Kerr, who became Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in 1967, the year he enunciated the federal 'urban-grant' university program, was not the first to trumpet the call for federal aid to urban universities. In 1958, Dr. Paul Ylvisaker of the Ford Foundation, at the 44th Biennial Meeting of the Association of Urban Universities, proposed that the land-grant college principle be applied to the urban university to enable it to become an urban problem solver. He also suggested that the Morrill Act of 1862 (the original land-grant college legislation) be revised on its centennial to support a multitude of urban extension services - in land use, housing, vocational guidance, nutrition, family budgets - to be backed by university-level continuous research on a scale equal to the old agricultural experimental stations. The basic plan, then, called for federal aid to urban universities, patterned after the land-grant act which would make money available so that urban universities could: 1) develop their capacities to solve urban problems; and 2) orient their educational, research and service facilities to the urban communities in which they were located.

Paul Ylvisaker, who was raised in the rural Midwest, joined the Ford Foundation in 1955 after completing a Ph.D. dissertation on rural government and working as a special secretary to the Mayor of Philadelphia. At Ford he developed grants to encourage academics to work on American's urban problems. Between 1959 and 1966, the Ford Foundation made grants totaling $4.5 million to eight universities and two non-academic institutions "for experiments in applying the nation's university resources directly to the problems of American cities".

Ylvisaker wanted the Ford Foundation to make a major statement about the nation's problems and the need for both universities and business to work on them. He also hoped that the Foundation's example would encourage large-scale federal support for urban universities not unlike the rural extension system by which colleges and universities had been able to affect the rural economy of the United States in earlier decades. The Foundation's grants, therefore, were made to leading land-grant institutions for both university-based and community-based development projects. The hope was that ultimately the presidents of these institutions would take the lead in pressing for legislation, most likely under the new Kennedy administration, to establish a system of federal urban-grant universities. That did not materialize. Instead, other forms of legislation dealing with cities evolved, much of it subsumed under the rubric of anti-poverty programs. The Ford Foundation's own evaluation of its urban extension grants operation, concluded it had helped produce the Community Service and Continuing Education Program contained under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title I provided for aid to continuing education and university extension programs in general but placed emphasis on urban issues.

By the late Sixties, the political and social atmosphere in the United States was markedly different from the Eisenhower era in which Dr. Ylvisaker first spoke about the urban-grant university. America was forced to recognize its urban problems after the Watts rebellion in 1965, and after Chicago in 1966 and Detroit in 1967 were engulfed in flames. The Civil Rights Movement, too, drew much attention to ghetto poverty, racial discrimination in education, employment and housing and the undeniable fact that the ethnic composition of American cities had changed greatly since World War II. Many cities had acquired not only substantial new and poverty-stricken Black and Hispanic communities, but in some cases the minorities comprised the majority of the inner city.

It was within this social context and during the period, in which part of the Federal Government's response was the War on Poverty and the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), that Clark Kerr publicly expounded the concept of a federal 'urban-grant' university program. It was also during the peak expansionist period of American Higher Education and after the publication of his well-received book The Uses of the University in which he defined the American university as a multiversity or federal grant university. At that juncture, in his City College address, Kerr suggested the establishment of 67 urban-grant universities to match the country's 67 land-grant colleges. Just as the land-grant state universities had aided the development of scientific agriculture and acceptance of a college education for the children of farmers, Kerr proposed similar action by the federal government to deal with contemporary urban problems. He maintained that the urban university had the capacity to develop solutions to urban ills. It contained, he argued, professional personnel to research and produce better ways to manage and deliver city services than could be discovered by the usual party politicians. (I always considered it unfortunate that Mayor Lindsay found it necessary to underwrite the establishment of Rand Corporation of New York for objective advice on the city's problems rather than to turn over this assignment to CUNY.) However, to carry out that task, the urban university would need a system of direct federal grants by-passing state governments, to become involved with and responsive to their communities. Since urban universities were increasingly serving a large Black and Hispanic population, the rural, small-town bias of state legislatures was seen as a serious factor inhibiting the development of an urban-grant movement. Therefore, Kerr thought the federal government should support the major urban colleges and universities which had demonstrated their intent to serve their communities.

Clark Kerr had 'identified' the university located in the heart of the city and portrayed it as the proper higher educational institution to supply extension services to cope with urban needs and problems. This was different from Paul Ylvisaker's urban-grant university which was to be a land-grant university with an urban extension. Dr. Kerr spoke during the Sixties, an era of educational expansion, and he looked to the federal government as the logical source of funding for new institutions as many others did. In the Seventies, during an era of financial constraint in education, the government's policy changed from institutional assistance to student assistance so that the urban-grant university concept was difficult to realize. Kerr's core idea, however, struck me as vitally important, i.e., that applied research and public service, focussed on the problems of the city and carried out in some sort of partnership with it, are major aspects of an urban university's mission, second only to its function as educator. It was this core idea, of integrating teaching, applied research and public service, that guided my thinking about what City College's 'urban mission' might become during the decade of the Seventies.

During my first year at City College, the definition of the urban mission for public higher education developed slowly because so much of my attention was drawn into "crisis management". whether it was the sale and use of drugs on campus (see Chapter 7), or the attempt by a

Harlem community organization called "Fight Back" to use City College as the instrument for increasing the number of minority workers in New York's construction industry (see Chapter 7), or the necessity to secure final State approval of the $150 million Physical Master Plan for the College (see Chapter 8). These urgent issues required quick and decisive action on the part of Central Administration and reduced the time available for academic master planning. Nevertheless, Kerr's ideas influenced me to consider how City College might take a leadership role in developing a teaching and research program of major proportions devoted to urban problems.

My first plan was very grandiose - to establish a "National Center for Urban Problems (NCUP) at City College. By the latter part of October (1970), I had prepared a memorandum providing the rationale for City College being in a unique position to accept responsibility for creating NCUP. I developed a rather long list of arguments, of which I shall only quote the first three to give the flavor of the thinking in those days of innocence:

> "City College is located in the largest city of the United States where the customary problems of any large metropolitan area (transportation, housing, education, quality of the urban environment, etc.) are greatly magnified...
>
> City College is located in a section of New York City which exposes the College unequivocally to the additional urban problems of race, poverty and vast ghetto areas...
>
> The public sources of funds for City College generate enormous pressures for the College to become involved in the problems of the immediate community and the city as a whole. It behooves the College to blueprint its own long-range educational plans for coming to grips with the ills of New York and to propose solutions applicable to cities everywhere and to the Harlem Community in particular."

I sent the NCUP memorandum to several distinguished City College alumni (Professor Nathan Glazer of Harvard, Professor Chester Rapkin of Columbia and member of the New York City Planning Commission, and others) and convened a meeting to secure their input. Professor Glazer wrote the statement summarizing the consequences of that meeting, from which I quote a portion:

> "our proposal is for a research center of the problems of very large cities. Centered on New York, it would deal not only with New York. Tokyo, London, Paris, Moscow and other cities share in varying degrees similar problems. The city of ten million has problems which make it in many respects more similar to another city of ten million in another country than a city of one million or one hundred thousand in its own country...
>
> This is an area of research that is not crowded. While in each of these cities important research is carried on, there is relatively little contact between the researchers, and what is learned in one is not easily communicated to another...
>
> One aspect of our urban problems - an aspect of great concern to the city and to those who try to think ahead for it - is that the quality of personnel is in decline, or at any rate inadequate to the problems with which they must contend...
>
> General professional concerns in the fields of education, engineering, architecture, social work, and the like, whatever their importance, are not particularly attuned to the problems of great metropolitan areas such as New York...
>
> We believe the single most important contribution City College can make to urban problems is to develop modes of teaching and training and apprenticeship in all these areas that will help produce for the next decades the kind of city employees who can deal more effectively with the problems they will face."

These ideas seemed to be quite provocative, and armed with the support of the distinguished alumni group of urbanologists, I approached the Ford Foundation for a planning grant. Unbeknown to me at the time, Ford had invested heavily five years earlier in Columbia University to be responsive to the "problem and opportunity of Harlem" (see Chapter 7) and I was turned down. With other possible sources of funding for a national center for urban problems unavailable, it was necessary to scale down the concept from NCUP to UCUP (University Center for Urban Problems).

The more "modest" concept was to mobilize the faculty resources of the entire City University to develop graduate level research and degree programs that would focus on the great variety of problems afflicting New York City. UCUP would become the "think tank" for New York City (thereby displacing the rather costly Rand Corporation of New York) and the educational arm for the continuous upgrading of the city's professional cadres. I broached the idea to Professor Arthur Bierman (Physics), then Chairman of the City College Faculty Senate, who responded warmly to the suggestion. In the Spring of 1971, I appointed Professor Bierman Acting Provost, charged with responsibility for putting together a design for UCUP. Professor Bierman and Professor Elliot Zupnick, a member of the City College Economics Department who had transferred to the CUNY Graduate Center as an Associate Dean, worked together that Spring, polling various CUNY units on what urban-oriented programs were in operation, meeting with other CUNY college presidents, drawing up an organizational structure for UCUP and even commencing a search for a UCUP director.

UCUP as such never got off the ground; it died in its embryonic stage when it was co-opted by the CUNY Vice-Chancellor for Urban Affairs, Julius Edelstein. Vice Chancellor Edelstein had been brought into the deliberations of the UCUP Planning Committee and apparently thought that such a Center appropriately fell within his jurisdiction. He was also confident that a Center under his direction could obtain funding through the City Budget. At that point, President Joseph Murphy pulled Queens College out of the project, Vice-Chancellor Edelstein received approval from the BHE for the establishment of the CUNY Office of Urban Policy and Programs under his aegis and UCUP -

at least in its original format - collapsed. Vice-Chancellor Edelstein succeeded in developing an Urban Academy which upgraded the training of New York City personnel but, without the structured consortium of interested CUNY colleges pledged to pool faculty resources for research on urgent New York City problems, the CUNY "think tank" never materialized.

As a consequence of the demise of UCUP, I spent time during the Summer of 1971 rethinking the urban-grant university concept and its possible application at City College. The result was the creation in August, 1971 at City College of the Center of Urban and Environmental Problems (CUEP), through which I felt the College could make its proper contribution in the urban area and take its place in the CUNY system alongside the Department of Urban Affairs at Hunter College and the Institute for Community Studies at Queens College. Before the formation of CUEP was formally announced, a series of planning sessions had been held with interested City College faculty members which resulted in an Executive Committee consisting of Professor John Davis (Political Science), as Chairman, Professor Albert Madansky, (Computer Sciences) as Vice-Chairman, and Dr. Theodore Brown, my Academic Assistant, as Executive Secretary. In addition to the Executive Committee, a larger policy council was established which proceeded to elect a Membership Committee to establish types and standards for faculty membership in CUEP, a Grants and Proposals Committee to generate urban-related research and to assist in acquiring funds for such research, and finally a Search Committee to find a permanent Director for CUEP. Faculty Senate approval was readily forthcoming and it seemed that

CUEP had been firmly institutionalized.

During its first year, 1971-72, CUEP conducted a study of ongoing teaching and research activities in the field of urban affairs at the College. As part of this effort, a faculty seminar, directed by Mr. Roger Starr, Executive Director of the Citizen's Housing and Planning Council of New York (and later Housing Commissioner of New York) provided a forum for social scientists, scientists and engineers at the College to explore a broad range of urban problems on an interdisciplinary level. The same faculty seminar enabled the Executive Committee to bring many nationally known experts in the developing field of urban affairs (incuding Professor Ylvisaker) to the campus in order to discuss the problems involved in establishing successful interdisciplinary teaching and research programs in this area.

One of the most successful activities during the 1971-72 academic year was the sponsorship, with the Seminar on the "Changing Metropolis in America" at Columbia University, of a two-day symposium (in May 1972) on "A New Government for the City of New York." The purposes of the symposium were twofold: 1) to stake a claim for CUEP and the City College Department of Political Science in what was supposed to be an ongoing process of study of the City of New York with a view to its reorganization; 2) to make a contribution at a crucial period to the investigations being undertaken preliminary to the establishment of a new structure for the City of New York. At the time, three Commissions - the Scott, Wagner, Van den Heuvel Commissions - had been studying the government of the City of New York. Mayor Lindsay had been promoting administrative decentralization for some time. Toward the latter part of 1971, the five borough presidents began increasingly to push for charter revisions on the November 1972 ballot, revisions designed to increase the power of the borough presidents at the expense of the Mayor. It did not seem that a fundamental change of government of the City of New York ought to come about without an input from leading scholars and governmental officials who had been traditionally concerned with the organization of the government of New York City. The joint sponsorship of this symposium by City and Columbia was a good beginning.

CUEP thus ended its first year of operation by establishing a credible presence for itself. Apart from the symposium, it had sensitized the City College faculty to urban studies as an area for research, teaching and service. An urban research inventory taken by Professor Davis revealed that there were over seventy faculty members engaged in urban-related research projects - a good start towards disciplinary inter-relationships among the faculty. However, although CUEP aroused a reasonable amount of enthusiasm during the academic year 1971-72, it started losing momentum during the next year because of the lack of resources. It became clear to me that at best it could only be a supportive device, a patchwork of revision and extension of existing programs dealing with urban affairs and urban problems. It could not substitute for an 'urban-grant' university, and I was still trying to find a way to acquire the equivalent of an "urban-grant university status" posture for the College without having the financial base of federal urban-grant university legislation. I was still convinced that Clark Kerr's urban-grant university concept was ideally suited to the particular history, experience and current goals of City College. Urban-grant university status for City College, or its equivalent, would make it possible to bring together a wide range of special programs which the College was attempting to initiate in order to serve the needs of a more diverse student body and a greater variety of urban communities than any other university in the nation.

In fact, Clark Kerr met on several occasions with members of the College's Central Administration to consult and to make recommendations about possible strategies for implementation of the urban-grant university concept. My assistants, Dr. Camilla Auger and Dr. Theodore Brown, working closely with the CUEP Executive Committee, went to Washington D.C. to discuss some of the CUEP and urban-grant university proposals with government officials and were able to arrange a visit to City College in November, 1971 of four influential Washington officials. Those who came to City College for extensive discussions were Dr. Edward Davis, President Nixon's Science Advisor; Dr. Peter Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Mr. Leonard Garment, Special White House Assistant for Minority Affairs; and Mr. Theodore Britton of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For the visit I wrote a proposal, "Urban Grant Pilot Project for City College", which contained most of the essential components of what later came to be known as the Urban Educational Model.

In that early proposal, I discussed several pressing reasons why I felt that the 'urban-grant' university idea was one of special significance and cogency for City College:

"The arguments for undertaking an urban-grant pilot project at City College are manifold but only several need be given. First and foremost, City College must educate a very special student body with an extraordinary mix of ethnic backgrounds and academic preparation. By virtue of its location, City College carries the largest responsibility, among all the established senior colleges of the City University of New York, for the training of Black, Hispanic and Asian students. Its 2000 SEEK students (from designated "poverty" neighborhoods), and its large freshman and sophomore classes of "open admissions" students entering the College outside the normal track, comprise a high percentage of the undergraduate population. This means that through remediation, counseling and tutorial services, the College is helping to prepare thousands of New York City young people for job opportunities that would otherwise have remained closed to them. After working through basic remedial and compensatory courses administered by the College of Liberal Arts and Science, many of these students will receive further training for a wide variety of professional careers...

Another factor that favors urban-grant status for City College is the presence of four major professional schools -- Architecture, Education, Engineering and Nursing -- on the College campus. These four professional schools, together with the College of Liberal Arts and Science, are in an excellent position to develop new programs leading to urban-related career options for the Open Admissions and SEEK students, as well as for the academically well-prepared students. Furthermore, the talent residing in the faculties of all five schools can be used as the base to initiate the creation of new inter-discipinary professional centers and institutes in the urban area...

A third consideration is that the pride engendered by the prominence of City College gradutes in many walks of life has enabled the College to retain the loyalty and devotion of its alumni to an amazing degree. There is every expectation that a major alumni fund-raising and special gifts campaign can be mounted to match funds from federal sources. The possibility of substantial private matching funds will greatly enhance the impact of urban-grant funds from the federal government...

Finally, the huge improvements in physical plant planned for City College (...at an estimated cost of $150 million...) will provide adequate housing for the College's present academic programs and the new schools, centers and institutes which are now being blueprinted as part of our Academic Master Plan for the 1970's and beyond. The added important advantage of this construction program will be the impetus given to the process of urban renewal in the entire surrounding geographical area. City College can and should become the nucleus of a magnificent "educational park" or mini-city..."

I then proceeded to enumerate some of the specifics of the Academic Master Plan that City College was developing "to make the urban-grant idea a reality." This Academic Master Plan was outlined under three headings: I - "Experiments in Remedial Education and Pre-College Preparation"; II - "Alternatives to Undergraduate Education"; III - "New Inter-disciplinary Professional and Graduate Programs."

Under Heading I - "Experiments in Remedial Education and Pre-College Preparation", I stated that City College had "pioneered in the development of innovative teaching techniques for remediation". I pointed out that a Writing Laboratory had been established, under the direction of Professor Mina Shaughnessy,

> "to provide intensive individual help for Open Admissions and SEEK students with language problems...the continuing individual attention that they receive is geared to their particular needs and rates of progress and lessens the sense of alienation and lack of confidence of first year students encountering a large urban university for which they have been ill-prepared...the curriculum developed for this program will be published to serve as a model for other urban colleges throughout the country".

(The last promise was fulfilled through the publication by Oxford University Presss of the late Mina Shaughnessy's classic in the field, "Errors and Expectations".) I mentioned other remedial programs "in the planning stage" (a great number have since been implemented - see Chapter 3) and concluded my remarks concerning Part I of the Academic Master Plan with the statement:

> "City College is exploring the feasibility of running an experimental high school - under the joint jurisdiction of the College and the Board of Education - which could advance innovation in urban teaching methods and teacher training...such an arrangement would provide the students at the high school with an extremely rich learning environment and enable substantial numbers of them to enter the College as freshmen with much better preparation than might otherwise be possible".

(this promise has also been fulfilled - again see Chapter 3).

Under Heading II - "Alternatives to Undergraduate Education", I spoke about City College having an obligation - in fulfillment of its historic mandate to "educate the children of the whole people" - to

> "develop a series of alternative approaches to undergraduate education that would help match the wide spectrum of interests and abilities of our student body and would emphasize those aspects of particular significance to the urban community".

Under this rubric, I mentioned the Pilot Program in Humanistic Studies (which did not succeed in its original form but finally evolved into the program "Liberal Arts, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy" discussed in Chapter 4) and the new Ethnic Studies Departments. The Ethnic Studies Departments are treated more fully in Chapter 5 as well as the as - yet - unfilled hope expressed in this early proposal that

> "through the introduction of such courses as the Inter-Cultural Survey Course, the new Ethnic Studies Departments would actually work against the tendency, evident in our city and others, to ethnic myopia and cultural atomism".

The third program mentioned under Heading II was performing arts, with the promise that the College would establish "new undergraduate professional degree options on both the artistic and technical levels". I also stated that

> "the resident artist, visiting lecturers, special productions and other activities envisaged within the framework of the Center (The Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts) will not only serve the students in the Center but also help to enrich the cultural climate on the campus as well as provide splendid cultural programs for the surrounding community".

With the completion of the architecturally beautiful Aaron Davis Hall (after a series of delays - see Chapter 8) and the approval of the B.F.A. (Bachelor of Fine Arts) degree, these promises are being fulfilled with distinction.

Under Heading III - "New Interdisciplinary Professional and Graduate Programs", this early blueprint of the College's Academic Master Plan argued for the expansion of the College's "curricular, research and service capacities to the point where it could more properly respond to the insistent problems of its urban environment". It promised to

> "improve existing courses in the urban field and aid in the design of new teaching programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels".

It promised certain urban-related interdisciplinary research activities and "in the area of community problem-solving", it talked about making the College's "talents and resources available to local groups working on local problems as well as to New York City agencies". Under the same heading, this early blueprint stated that

> "City College is now formulating plans for bold new medical and health sciences programs. We are proposing to establish a Center of Medical and Health Sciences with several major components: one component focussing on some form of medical training, a second on an inter-professional health services program involving the Schools of Nursing and Engineering and the Department of Clinical Psychology, and a third leading to the creation of a novel type of pre-medical program with intensive science preparation, some community medicine experience and perhaps even clinical exposure".

(Much of this early thinking under Heading III was later implemented - through the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education, the Health Technology Program, the "enriched" pre-medical program, and in other ways - see Chapter 6.)

I concluded this early blueprint for the City College Master Plan with the statement:

> "It is evident that the urban educational leadership role envisaged for City College can only be accomplished by supplementing the city-state budget with an infusion of federal funds matched by private giving. A stable mechanism for federal funding would be the conferring of urban-grant status on the college and, similarly, private giving could be placed on a secure foundation by raising capital gifts and endowment funds. Federal urban-grant university

status for City College matched by private giving on a generous scale from individuals, foundations and corporations will enable the College to build a great future on the foundations of its illustrious past."

The afore-mentioned memorandum, "Urban-Grant Pilot Project for City College", that I prepared for the Visiting Team from Washington D.C. in November 1971 was essentially the first blueprint of an academic master plan. I was attempting to sell, in reality, a federal urban-grant program to key persons in the executive branch of the federal government. The discussions with the Visiting Team were followed up within the next several months by visits to Washington by Drs. Brown, Auger and myself to confer with key congressmen involved in higher education legislation (e.g. Senator Jacob Javits, Representatives Ogden Reid, Albert Quie, James Scheuer, and John Brademas). It became clear by mid-1972 that, despite friendly interest in the notion of an urban-grant university in the executive and legislative branches of the federal government, comprehensive federal funding to urban colleges could not realistically be expected in the near future. Since I had tried to sell the urban-grant proposal as a whole package and had not succeeded, it was necessary to rethink its applicability and that of its component parts at City College. It was as if one stage in an experiment had failed and a new methodology had to be found. I had started out with broad concepts and a sweeping program and had to retrace my steps and refine my plans to a few specific programs that realistically could be implemented and turned into a base for a broader program later.

I was still confident that the urban-grant university concept was an idea whose time had come - indeed, was long overdue. But, while waiting for others to accept it, it was still the obligation of my administration and the faculty to interpret the trends to best prepare City College students to take their place in the ranks of those who would help solve the problems of the Seventies and Eighties. We had, therefore, to concentrate our efforts on the skillful use of the many different federal programs which were included in current legislation in order to support educational innovation. We also had to begin to rely, I was convinced, on the alumni, private foundations and corporations for financial support of major new educational ventures. In the interim, I continued to use the November 1971 "Urban Grant Pilot Project" memorandum to structure City College development, to give substance to my thinking about the urban mission of the College and to define those steps that would help make the urban-grant university idea a reality in the future.

§3 The Urban Educational Model

In speaking about the November 1971 "Urban Grant Pilot Project" memo as the genesis of the "Urban Educational Model", I need to give credit to the groups and individuals who contributed to its formulation. I have acknowledged my indebtedness to Clark Kerr whose writings and personal expressions of interest in City College provided inspiration and guidance in our planning. The Middle States Report of 1966 and, to some extent, the Cartey memorandum contributed to our thinking about American higher education in an urban setting and, in particular, the special role that City College might play. I consulted on a regular basis with the other members of Central Administration - through the President's Cabinet which consisted during the first year or two not only of the other chief officers of the College but also of representatives of the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate and the Alumni Association. I met with all the Deans, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee of the Student Senate through the President's Advisory Council. It was customary for me to meet on a regular basis with the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate and at frequent intervals with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. I attended most of the monthly meetings of the Faculty Senate. I was given the opportunity to influence the governance structure of the Faculty Senate early in my administration and was instrumental in creating the Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee to encourage college-wide input into the educational planning for the College. I spoke to many chapters of the City College Alumni Association, was invited to attend all meetings of the City College Fund Board, and created an additional advisory committee to the College, called the Board of Visitors, consisting of distinguished alumni and non-alumni citizens who could be helpful in the planning of the College's future.

All of these forums and many individuals had an impact on the blueprinting of the Academic Master Plan for City College during my presidency. But I must say that several more formal consultative mechanisms created during the two-year period - from the Fall of 1972 to the Fall of 1974 - at the suggestion of the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Dr. Alice Chandler, helped to transform the lofty rhetoric of my "Urban Grant Pilot Project" memo into the more subdued and concrete formulation of the Urban Educational Model. I am referring especially to the useful roles played by the Binder and Anderson Committees.

The Binder Committee was a faculty committee of nine members - representing the College of Arts and Science and the various professional schools at City College - appointed in consultation with the Faculty Senate and chaired by Professor Frederick Binder (Department of Social and Psychological Foundations, School of Education). It was supposed to make recommendations concerning an academic development plan for City College and its report was issued in December 1973. In the first part of the report entitled "Rationale for Change", the Committee made a very compelling statement:

> "The paradoxes of the professional lives of City College faculty are legion and not accidental. They have been trained for an elitist profession, but they are asked to perform democratic tasks; they have often written dissertations on abstruse subjects, but they are teaching remedial writing and mathematics; they are committed to the book, but their students have been culturally shaped by television and film; they have studied a body of culture that is fundamentally Western European, but they teach many students who are Black and Asian and Spanish; they pay homage to the history of western literature, but they are surrounded by the consequences of American history and the political presence of America; they are in departments that reflect inherited disciplines, but their work is involved with the culture of the world, with the language that is spoken by Americans, and with subjects that must be taught in an interdisciplinary fashion. One lists all these paradoxes collectively because they form a background against which City College educators seek to accomplish their central desire: the humanistic training of a new generation of students."

The Binder Committee proceeded to make a cogent analysis of all facets of an academic development plan for City College covering such topics as: "quality of campus life", "education for a diverse student body", "professional and vocational needs of students", "high school articulation", "graduate articulation", and ending with the provocative section "The Challenge of the Future". Under the last category, the Binder Committee supported my plans for the establishment of a series of centers and institutes which could "strengthen the College by helping it to perform its urban mission more effectively". The Binder Committee continued its analysis of the proposed centers and institutes of the evolving urban educational model as follows:

> "The President, while aware of the problems of governance involved in building innovative new institutes and centers, has argued that such educational units, addressed to particular scholarly and teaching problems, strengthen the institution in several ways. First, they allow the College to maintain its on-going established programs and still be responsive to urban citizens and the urban setting. Second, they attract and hold superior students who take work throughout the College. Third, they facilitate inter- and multi-disciplinary studies, thereby allowing students and faculty members to move beyond the boundaries of a single department within the College. Finally, they demonstrate to potential supporters and funding agencies on whom the College must rely in a variety of ways that City College can respond to legitimate, changing educational needs which demand the involvement and cooperation of experts from many fields."

The work of the Binder Committee was most valuable in both validating the Urban Educational Model and placing it within the context of a total academic development plan for the College. The total context was emphasized in Chairman Binder's Preface to his committee's report:

> "We have endorsed President Marshak's plans for the creation and support of centers and institutes designed to foster a distinctive urban-metropolitan university. His vision, his enthusiasm and his labors, we believe, are worthy of our support. At the same time, however, we have not lost sight of the fact that this college has served and will continue to serve the majority of its students through existing programs in the liberal arts and the professions. It is our strong conviction that the health of the College is dependent upon attending to the long-standing needs of the institution as we have known it no less than upon striking out in new directions. It is to be hoped that this document will help facilitate the labor, cooperation and financial support necessary to ensure that the future of City College will be even more glorious than its past."

Faculty Senate Chairman Chandler's comment on the Binder Report is also worth quoting:

> "According to the Binder Report, the future of the College is integrally bound up with its liberal arts tradition. Just because

"it is in the eye of the moral storm," the College must, more than ever, continue to foster a broadly humanistic education for all its students."

The Anderson Committee was a committee of three faculty appointed by the Faculty Senate and chaired by Professor Clarence Anderson (Department of Civil Engineering of the School of Engineering). The other two members were Professor George McDonald, (of the SEEK program), and Professor Samuel Mintz (of the English Department). The Anderson Report appeared several months after the Binder Report and was basically intended as a critique of the Binder Report. One center that it supported very strongly, the Center for Academic Skills, was later established as part of the Urban Educational Model. The Anderson Report was very similar in spirit to the Binder Report but took the trouble of giving its priorities to the various centers, institutes and programs under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model. For example, its low ranking of the Pilot Program for Humanistic Studies later influenced the decision to discontinue the program as part of the retrenchment process following the fiscal crisis of 1976 (see Chapter 4). On the other hand, some of the centers, institutes and programs to which the Anderson Committee gave the highest priority, (e.g. Center of Communications and Public Policy) could never get off the ground because no funds could be found to create them.

By April of 1974 I had appointed Professor Alice Chandler as Vice President for Institutional Resources as the first step in the possible launching of a major Development Campaign for City College. Dr. Chandler proceeded to organize a three-day workshop at the Greystone Conference Center in Riverdale in June 1974, attended by approximately 40 administrators and representatives of the faculty and student senates, at which the Binder and Anderson reports were discussed in depth. The deliberations of the Greystone Conference led to a sharper consensual formulation of the contemporary urban mission of City College, called the "Urban Educational Model" (UEM) and to a strong endorsement of the desirability of a Development Campaign. These decisions made it possible for Dr. Chandler and myself to prepare the UEM brochure during the Summer of 1974. The UEM brochure served as the basic document for the Development Campaign which was informally started in September 1974 and officially launched in November 1975 (see Chapter 8). During the Summer of 1974, I was invited to write an article entitled "Problems and Prospects of an Urban Public University" for a special issue of the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Science, "Daedulus", appearing on the tenth anniversary of the first student riots on the Berkeley campus in 1964. This article gave me an opportunity to explain the concept of the Urban Educational Model to a national audience.

Under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model, City College defined three major goals as follows:

> "1. To redefine traditional concepts of the "educable" by reaching out to students of all ages, backgrounds and degrees of preparation in the metropolitan area and to turn out well-educated graduates who will serve the city with diligence and dedication. In pursuing this goal, it is necessary to keep constantly in mind that the reality of open access cannot be allowed to undermine the College's reputation for academic excellence.
>
> 2. To develop rigorous urban curricula of interest to students both in the liberal arts and professional fields in order to produce

leaders capable of dealing sensitively and intelligently with the perplexing problems of the urban community. In pursuing this goal, the College must maintain its historic commitment to the centrality of liberal arts education while developing meaningful programs in response to new research and to new societal needs.

3. To channel to the maximum extent possible the research and service energies of the faculty -- in conjunction with student internships -- to improve the quality of urban life. Our objective here is to expand and develop programs that benefit the community of which the College is an integral part. Acceptance of this goal increases the College's capacity for service within the metropolitan area."

The three major goals of the Urban Educational Model enumerated above were not arrived at lightly. Some sense of the reasoning which led to the selection of these three major goals can be gleaned from some statements in my Daedulus article (Winter 1975). The tone was set by a marvelous quotation from Eric Hoffer, to wit:

> "Not a single human achievement was conceived or realized in the bracing atmosphere of steppes, forests or mountain tops. Everything was conceived and realized in the crowded, stinking little cities of Jerusalem, Athens, Florence, Shakespeare's London, Rembrandt's Amsterdam. The villages, the suburbs, are for the dropouts...we will decay, we will decline if we can't make our cities viable. That's where American's destiny will be decided - in the cities."

I then remarked that since, in the modern era (certainly in the United States), universities are the chief agents of social change,

> "Public institutions of higher learning located in the inner cities are in a class of their own: financial support from the public coffers obliges these educational institutions to serve all members of the urban community; location in the inner city propels these educational institutions into a conscious concern for the all-pervasive and exacerbating problems of ghetto life right outside their gates. The urban public university located in the inner city is truly part of the urban environment and must respond to the insistent pressures upon it by a throughgoing reassessment of its educational priorities and functions..."

This was followed by an analysis of the institutional role of such universities and led to an identification of the three major goals spelled out above.

I tried to convey a similar message in the UEM brochure when I wrote:

> "The problems of urban America command sustained attention. Widespread poverty and unemployment, inadequate health and legal services, deteriorated housing, outmoded transportation systems, rising crime and violence, and hazardous air and water pollution threaten the well-being and survival of our great metropolitan centers...The crisis of New York City reflects a deepening crisis for cities everywhere...The urban public university cannot ignore these problems, for the fates of our cities and of the colleges located within them are inextricably entwined. In order for the urban public university to fulfill its responsibilities, it must respond to the urgent needs of a citizenry that looks to it for leadership and skills. It must provide sound educational foundations and career opportunities to the thousands of students who come to it each year. And it must marshal its many assets - its scholarship and erudition, its heritage of humanistic values, and its capacity for creative research - and bring them to bear on the momentous problems of American society..."

Whichever rationale, if any, is persuasive to the reader -- the one spelled out in the Daedulus article or the one elaborated in the UEM brochure - the fact remains that I was groping to find an appropriate restatement in modern terms of the historic pledge of City College: to educate "the children of the whole people" and to serve the metropolitan community. The three goals of the Urban Educational Model became the vehicle for this restatement. Each of the UEM goals constituted a major challenge and not all three goals were implemented with equal success or equal approbation. The remaining chapters of these "Memoirs" basically recount the failures and the successes, the opposition and the remarkable expressions of support that I experienced in pushing forward the implementation of the Urban Educational Model.

Thus, Goal 1 of the Urban Educational Model is dealt with in Chapter 3 under the title "Open Access, Open Admissions and Open Warfare". In the Daedulus article, this goal is articulated under the title: "To Promote the Widespread Diffusion of Skills and Knowledge.". Whatever the title, it is the story of dedicated City College faculty pioneering in the development of a series of innovative teaching techniques for remediation (whether in Basic Writing, College Skills or in Mathematics); or creating a Center for Academic Skills; or securing grants to increase the numbers of minority students in such disciplines as Science, Engineering and Biomedicine; or helping with the curriculum design for an experimental comprehensive high school on the City College campus. These positive efforts are played out against a background of fiscal austerity throughout the decade (reaching disaster proportions in 1976) and varying degrees of opposition from members of the City College community and fellow New Yorkers.

Chapter 4, entitled "Liberal Arts in an Urban Environment", discusses that part of Goal 2 of the Urban Educational Model pertaining to liberal arts. The changing composition of the student body and the declining student interest in traditional liberal arts disciplines during the decade of the Seventies - a national phenomenon - encouraged experiments in non-traditional liberal arts education at City College. These experiments, running the gamut from the short-lived Pilot Program in Humanistic Studies to the highly successful Leonard Davis Center for the Performing Arts, are described in this Chapter. After the fiscal crisis of 1976, faculty efforts were redoubled to "humanize" and "urbanize" the liberal arts curriculum. An interdisciplinary Core Curriculum was approved by the Faculty Council (of the College of Arts and Science) and serious attention was given to striking out in new directions to forge a clear link between a liberal arts-centered curriculum and pre-professional clusters of courses oriented towards public policy. Chapter 4 concludes with a summary of the set of "Liberal Arts, Pre-Professional and Public Policy" programs that are being funded by a major grant from the Mellon Foundation.

Chapter 5, entitled "Ethnicity, Ethnic Studies and the Third World", is, in a sense, a continuation of Chapter 4 on the changes in liberal arts education triggered by the turbulent social forces of an urban environment. The increasing role of non-White ethnic groups in New York City (and other large American cities) and their concerns with ethnic heritage and cultural identity were translated into ethnic studies departments. Chapter 5 traces the transformation of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies into four ethnic studies departments (Asian, Black, Jewish and Puerto Rican) and the comprehensive Urban Educational Model with its well-defined goals. During the early Seventies, the four ethnic studies departments consolidated their separate departmental status (with varying degrees of success as will be discribed) and impacted on the formulation and implementation of the Urban Educational Model. In the late Seventies, some of the ethnic studies departments participated actively in the "internationalization" of the Urban Educational Model with particular emphasis on the needs of "Third World" nations. The role of the Black Studies Department - working closely with other departments in the College of Arts and Science and the professional schools at City College - in connection with the Nigerian-U.S. Workshop on "Technological Developments of Nigeria", is a laudable example of this trend. Chapter 5 concludes with a brief discussion of some unfinished business, namely the interethnic programs.

Probably the program most closely identified with the Urban Educational Model at City College was the Biomedical Program. However, the Biomedical Program was only one example of the professional studies part of Goal 2 of the Urban Educational Model. Other examples were the six-year B.A.-J.D. program in Urban Legal Studies and the five-year program in Urban Architecture. All these programs had in common the following key components:

1) The faculty selected a well-defined career objective and determined the number of years it would take to educate the student in a way that would implant the career goal firmly in an urban, humanistic interdisciplinary context.

2) After deciding on the duration of the educational program, the faculty designed a curriculum that integrated liberal arts and sciences with the professional subjects so that the motivation of the student was optimized. This usually required the introduction of one or more professional courses during the freshman and/or sophomore years of college so that the young student became better acquainted with the profession to which he aspired. The design of the curriculum also had to ensure that vocational concerns meshed with broad knowledge, an awareness of other disciplines related to the professional subjects, and general humanistic values.

3) The clinical, laboratory, or field work associated with the professional courses gave the undergraduate student exposure to the urgent needs of the urban community. This early and continuous exposure to the problems of the city during the impressionable college years increased the chances of the graduate accepting a role in the urban community through the choice of a career in an urban-oriented profession, a municipal agency, or one of the new institutions concerned with public needs.

4) The curriculum for the specified career goal received an urban emphasis. This was accomplsihed through the inclusion in the integrated curriculum of liberal arts and science courses illuminating the conditions of urban life and demonstrating the desperate need for talented persons to become involved in the improvement of the quality of life in the cities.

Chapter 6, entitled "Training Tomorrow's Urban Professionals and Affirmative Action" discusses two of the integrated liberal arts-professional programs developed under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model. The Urban Legal Studies Program is considered first and then the Biomedical Program is treated at some length. The discussion of the Biomedical Program includes the biomedical suit and the biomedical trial and the entire account reveals plainly and painfully the pitfalls of trying to "humanize" and "urbanize" professional education within the socio-political milieu of New York City. The Biomedical Program became a bellweather of the capability of City College to maintain and update its humanistic mission for a multi-ethnic student body during the decade of the Seventies. Its continued success despite ethnic intolerance and judicial insensitivity augurs well for the adaptability of City College to the constantly changing demands placed upon it by a city in flux.

Chapter 7 contains a discussion of the implications of Goal

3 of the Urban Educational Model, namely the development of research programs and the provision of service in the areas related to the quality of urban life. This included significant community service and assistance to New York City in projects which the College could enter with special competency and which the community greatly desired and needed. Goal 3 of the Urban Educational Model led to the creation of an Office of Public and Community Affairs, which gave structure to the College's efforts to serve the neighboring and larger urban community. Many recent developments on the City College campus possessed great potential for improving the quality of life in the neighborhood of City College and for setting an example of how the shared concerns of a public university and an urban community could be transformed into constructive action for mutual benefit. These developments are described in Chapter 7 and are placed within the framework of the Urban Grant University concept. This chapter concludes with some early history of the Urban Grant University concept, the role of City College in the creation of CUPU (Committee for Urban Program Universities) and the present status of Urban Grant University legislation (initiated by CUPU).

I conclude the present chapter, "From the Five Demands to the Urban Educational Model" with the observation that I have come full circle since Goal 3 of the Urban Educational Model is really the motivating force behind the Urban Grant University. The underlying theme of Clark Kerr's Phi Beta Kappa address - with which I started this chapter - is fairly close to the arguments given in support of

Goal 3 of the Urban Educational Model in my Daedulus article and in the UEM brochure. However, the profound difference is - and this is the meaning of the choice of title of these memoirs, "Academic Renewal in the Seventies", is that the substantial accomplishments of City College under the rubric of Goals 1 and 2 of the Urban Educational Model have placed it in a much more advantageous position to implement Goal 3 during the decade of the Eighties. The reasons why community outreach, improving the quality of urban life, and urban-grant status can now become more than rhetoric, and the possibilities of a new partnership between City College and its surrounding community will all be discussed in Chapter 7.

Chapter 3

Open Admissions, Open Warfare and Open Access

§1 Open Admissions (1970-1976)

The most complicated, controversial, long-term issue confronting City College during my presidency -- and even today -- was the institution of a change in admissions policy on September 1, 1970 made by the BHE that came to be known throughout the country as Open Admissions.

Open Admissions for City College was a misnomer from its very inception and the widespread and persistent misconceptions of Open Admissions, in and of themselves, produced some of the unfortunate consequences to which its original opponents could point in later years with satisfied vindication. The Open Admissions policy adopted by the BHE for September 1970 - five years before its projected starting date in an earlier Master Plan - did not guarantee a place at City College (or any other senior college of the City University) to every graduate of a New York City public high school. Under Open Admissions policy, students who maintained an 80% high school average or better, or who finished in the top half of their graduating class, could enter a CUNY senior college. High school graduates with lesser grades or class rank (an average below 80% or in the lower half of the graduating class) could enter one of the CUNY community colleges. It was true that substantial numbers of students in the top half of the graduating class of the academically less demanding high schools could thus enter CUNY senior colleges with averages below 80% and that many of these students required remedial work in order to compensate for their inferior high school preparation.

The public image of Open Admissions policy was so distorted that as recently as March 23, 1979, the prestigious weekly magazine *Science* (the official organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science) carried as its lead editorial a piece by a department chairman at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) entitled "Can Meritocracy in Academe Be Saved?", in which the following statement was made (italics mine):

> "The once great City College of New York, which for 50 years produced more graduates who went on to earn doctorates than all but one other American college, *dropped all entrance standards in 1969.*"

The paradoxical fact is that there were no entrance standards for admission to City College (other than a high school diploma) until the year 1924 when the College first required a minimum high school average (HSA). The Open Admissions policy which the *Science* editorial questioned actually prevailed at City College before 1924, when a minimum HSA of 72% was required for admission. This minimum HSA gradually increased to 80% by 1940 and attained a high of 86% by 1969, the year before the new Open Admissions policy was instituted.

Before considering the impact on City College of this new Open Admissions policy, I should set some of the record straight with regard to the awareness on the part of the Board of Higher Education (BHE) of the necessity to give due recognition to the higher educational needs of the new low income groups in a changing city. As early as February, 1966, the BHE affirmed its determination "to offer the benefits of post-high school education to all residents of New York City who are able and eager to avail themselves of these benefits." The BHE called:

> "upon the City and the State of New York to give the City University with all deliberate speed the physical facilities and fiscal support, together with the flexibility of administrative procedures, which will enable it to carry out the aforesaid program for 100% tuition-free coverage of New York City public higher educational needs without delay."

The BHE reaffirmed its commitment to an Open Admissions policy in its 1968 Master Plan and proposed the expansion of facilities and programs to meet its goals by 1975.

At its July 9, 1969 meeting, in response to the occupation of the South Campus at City College, the BHE decided to accelerate the timetable for achieving Open Admissions and directed the Chancellor to investigate the feasibility of offering admissions - as defined at the beginning of this chapter - commencing with the Fall of 1970, to all New York City residents who graduated from high school in June 1970, and who would graduate in subsequent years.

While the immediate reason for moving Open Admissions ahead by five years has been noted, several reasons of principle persuaded the BHE to reconsider its original timetable for achieving Open Admissions. First and foremost, the BHE recognized that a major function of CUNY was to serve as a means for providing upward mobility for the lower income population of the City. CUNY, however, had been rejecting students who were likely to come from the lowest income families of the City because high school average and test scores were being used as the sole criteria for regular admissions. After World War II and increasingly into the Sixties, low high school averages appeared to be related to low family income level. By implementing Open Admissions, CUNY believed it would offer admission to larger numbers of students who came from families at or near the poverty level. It was also well-known to CUNY officials that a lack of space and facilities had artifically raised the required HSA and excluded students who were prepared for college.

From its experience with a variety of special programs, particularly SEEK and College Discovery (the counterpart of SEEK at the Community College), CUNY believed that it could develop strategies to educate effectively large numbers of students with the motivation and potential but not the high school average associated with academic preparation for college study. Finally, the BHE was of the opinion that Open Admissions was essential to the continued well-being of New York City, an opinion supported at the time by employers and union leaders. In an atmosphere of rising expectations among its young people, coupled with their growing recognition that a college degree was essential to qualify for job placement in a market characterized by increasing demand for skilled workers, the BHE believed that it was desirable for CUNY to accept the difficult but necessary task of providing for Open Admissions at the earliest possible date.

In order to ensure the maintenance of academic standards as well as the success of Open Admissions, the BHE in 1970 called upon the CUNY colleges to devise programs which would include extensive remediation as basic tools for learning, tutorial assistance outside of the regular class schedule, individualized counseling and adequate financial aid to remove the economic barriers to full-time college attendance. The real difference and challenge implicit in the CUNY version of "Open Admissions," as contrasted with those tried in the past, was that through tutoring, remediation and counseling a genuine attempt was being made to keep the CUNY program from becoming a revolving door through which large numbers of students with ability but with inadequate preparation would be admitted and then dropped indiscriminately without a chance to demonstrate satisfactory performance. The guiding principle was that while CUNY could not guarantee that all students with deficiencies would overcome their handicaps, each student was given a chance to prove himself.

CUNY projected that "Open Admissions" for New York City high school graduates in 1970 would yield 45,000 to 50,000 freshmen entering the senior and community colleges of the CUNY system in September, 1970, more than double the number of freshmen entering CUNY in the previous academic year. In September 1970, when I took office, 2742 freshmen registered at City College, compared to 1752 freshmen the previous year. I have used several tables to quantify the impact of Open Admissions on City College during its first two years. Table 1 shows the number of entering students at the College with three ranges of high school averages over the three-year period 1969-1971, with 1969 as the last non-Open Admissions year and 1970 and 1971 the first two years of Open Admissions. The corresponding numbers are also given in Table 1 for the SEEK contingent at City College during the same three years.

Table 1

High School Academic Average of Freshmen Classes at CCNY (1969-1971)

	Admitted Via Regular Procedures				Admitted Via Spec. Programs (SEEK)			
Year	Reg. ≥80%	H.S. Avg. 70-79%	H.S. Avg. Below 70%	Un-Known	Reg.	H.S. Avg. 70-79%	H.S. Avg. Below 70%	Total
1969	1424	124	--	--	(total 204;breakdown unavailable)			1752
1970	1515	854	41	30	29	138	135	2742
1971	1256	1473	107	43	41	188	108	3216

Table 2 gives the ethnic breakdown of the freshman classes (including SEEK) at City College during the same three years. Table 3 gives the religious breakdown of the freshman clases (including SEEK) at the College during the years before and after Open Admissions while Table 4 gives the sex breakdown by different ethnic categories for the year 1971.

The figures in Tables 1-4 lead me to several observations that may help to explain the bitter controversy that plagued Open Admissions from the very day that I assumed the City College presidency. From Table 1 it is seen that the academic profile of the SEEK students is substantially lower than that of the non-SEEK students; this is not surprising since the guidelines for SEEK eligibility at that time required academic and economic disadvantagement which CUNY defined by a high school average below 80% as well as residency in a designated poverty area. Therefore, by design, at least 90% of the SEEK students were Black and Puerto Rican (approximately 2/3 Black, 1/3 Puerto Rican). This policy automatically brought to the campus sizable numbers of Black and Puerto Rican students who required remedial courses in

Table 2

Ethnic Breakdown of Freshmen Classes (Including SEEK) at CCNY 1969-71

Year	Black	Puerto Rican	Oriental (est.)	White	Other
1969	149 (8.5%)	86 (4.9%)	88 (5%)	1361 (77.7%)	67 (3.8%)
1970	655 (23.9%	225 (8.2%)	167 (6%)	1585 (57.8%)	115 (4.2%)
1971	804 (25.0%)	318 (9.9%)	193 (6%)	1830 (56.9%)	74 (2.3%)

Table 3

Religious Breakdown of Freshman Classes (Including SEEK) at CCNY 1969 and 1971)

Year	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant and Other
1969	491 (28%)	876 (50%)	386 (22%)
1971	1383 (43%)	836 (26%)	997 (31%)

Table 4

Sex Breakdown of Freshman Classes (Including SEEK) at CCNY 1971

	Black	Puerto Rican	Oriental	White and Other
Male	32%	54%	73%	69%
Female	68%	46%	27%	31%

order to prepare them for the regular college curriculum. Also, from Table 1, one observes that the first year of Open Admissions at City College brought to the campus approximately the same number of academically prepared students who would normally have come to the College but in addition a large number of poorly prepared students (the majority of whom were non-minority). By the second year of Open Admissions, the number of students coming to City College with averages above 80% had started to decline, a trend which began to feed on itself. In my view, this development resulted from the popular misconception - propagated by the mass media and opponents of free higher education for the "children of the whole people" - that City College had become the exclusive haven of the poorly prepared student and was no longer hospitable to the highly qualified one.

Tables 2 and 3 make it clear how Open Admissions plus an enlarged SEEK program at City College in 1970 produced marked changes in the ethnic and religious composition of the City College student body. While the Blacks had the largest increase in the number of enrolled freshmen as a result of Open Admissions, all ethnic and religious groups benefited from the Open Admissions policy. Even the Jewish student enrollment maintained the approximate absolute number between 1979 and 1971 although the percentage dropped by a factor of 2; unfortunately, the percentage figure was given the widest currency and the incorrect impression was given that City College was attempting to reduce the "Jewish presence" on its campus. This mistaken view, coupled with the popular misunderstanding concerning the nature of Open Admissions policy, interposed serious obstacles to developing the open access, multi-ethnic university of high quality that seemed to me to be City College's proper function in the largest city of the United States.

In the decades before Open Admissions, as noted above, a kind of fluid "open access" process had in fact allowed into the College large numbers of ill-prepared or non-English speaking students. But after the end of World War II, the competition for places at the City College turned "open access" into a more restrictive and selective admissions process. It was this restrictive, almost elitist trend that fostered among the faculty strong opinions about the new mission of City College and their own responsibilities within it.

During the period of the Sixties when most students came to the College with fairly high secondary school grade point averages, a number of programs were in place to allow entry by the lesser prepared students into the undergraduate and professional schools. One such alternative was the well-used route of the "non-matriculant," a student who, mostly at night, came into the College on probation, and whose performance over the first 12 to 30 credits could override his or her past record and guarantee admission as a degree matriculant.

The evening schools, however, failed to obtain the funding from the city that would have given them the full-time faculty members critical for their growth and development. And, it was obvious that neither the day schools nor the evening schools in CUNY were attracting what both educators and political leaders felt was an adequate number of New York's minority high school graduates. As I have described, the first experimental answer to this problem was City's Pre-Baccalaureate Program in 1965 which expanded into the State-wide SEEK program a year later. During its early period, SEEK enrolled students whose median high school averages were substantially lower than 80%; only 10% had averages over 80%, and 50% of the students in SEEK had averages below 70% (see Table 1). SEEK, however, devised many strategies - remediation, tutoring, counseling, financial subsidies - to increase the success rate of its students, strategies that were real because they were adequately funded by New York State.

As it was implemented, SEEK students were admitted separately; Open Admissions was the University's bold attempt to integrate "open access" and to bring a mix of all kinds of students directly into the mainstream of its senior four-year colleges. A noted poet who taught in CCNY's Basic Writing Program during the first years of Open Admissions said of her students:

> "The highly motivated but ill-prepared Black student, the Asian student channeled toward the sciences and with severe English-language deficiencies, the alienated second or third generation White student from parochial school, may all be the first of their families to enter college, may all have problems with writing and with college-level reading; but their relationship to almost everything has been different -- to America, to family, to the educational system, to the police, to the Standard English dialect. Openness and emotional accessibility differ, ways of surviving in a classroom differ, responses to stimuli differ...

> How we work with these and many more strands to design a writing course that can liberate these diversified groups into control of the American language and genuine articulation of their needs, becomes a more and more challenging question...(Adrienne Rich, "Final Comment on the Interdisciplinary Program, 1972).

Both SEEK and Open Admissions were watched with increasing concern by the liberal faculty, liberal that is, in the political sense, and by the politically conservative faculty, many of whom had banded together under the leadership of Sidney Hook of New York University, in a national watchdog group called the "University Centers for Rational Alternatives." Members of the CUNY faculty were largely White, male, lived not in Harlem certainly (hardly even in New York City itself), and had for the most part received their Ph.D.'s at private universities (chiefly Columbia and N.Y.U.). Open Admissions became a convenient point of dispute between the faculty, some of whom viewed the urban public university in the Seventies as having a social mission (a minority), and others (also a minority) who liked to perpetuate the myth that such a university should emulate its sister private institution in all respects. The majority probably espoused a mixture of these views, but were driven into opposition to Open Admissions when it confronted them with a life crisis: to teach types of students for which purpose they had not been trained, and to be open to questions regarding the boundaries and content of culture. The new route to success for faculty was becoming their discipline rather than their institution. But, some of the City College faculty, bound by pensions and traditions that had rewarded undergraduate teachers rather than research, were less able to join the new mobile professoriate in America.

> 'What really gnawed away at our innards and left us hollow... what coursed in our bodies like an incurable illness was our growing realization and fear that in middle age we no longer had a profession."
>
> (Theodore Gross, "How to Kill a College," Saturday Review, April, 1978.)

Scattered among these critics of all kinds were a few faculty who tried in a systematic way to discover in their New Students clues that would lead to New Education. Among these faculty was a remarkable person, the late Mina Shaughnessy, who taught remedial English at City College to SEEK students. Fred Hechinger, of The New York Times, a City College graduate, described Mina Shaughnessy's moment of discovery:

> "A crucial moment in Shaughnessy's progress came in 1972 when she was teaching in the City University's SEEK program (at City College)...One day the administration dumped 15 cartons containing 4,000 placement essays in her office. Instead of despairing of the task, she analyzed more than 2,000,000 words of student writing, trying to find out what was going on in the authors' minds. She concluded that all was not mere chaos and ignorance. Under the messy surface she detected a coherence in the students' mistakes. In many of the misspellings she discovered a pattern based on what students had misheard, or a particular formulation that came from a non-English usage."

As Mina Shaughnessy's analysis disclosed patterns in the writings of underprepared students, she proposed tentative solutions that were implemented in a Writing Laboratory. Students who wished to improve their writing were referred to this laboratory by teachers and counsellors and, in many instances, by self-referral. The program of the Writing Laboratory consisted of a writing checkup to find out what kind of help was needed - whether weekly sessions with a private tutor under the supervision of a teacher in charge or in group-tutoring sessions. More advanced students were assigned to independent study with assistance as needed for the tutor on duty.

With increasing understanding of these writing problems through "a sensibility at once acute, loving and brave" (to use Benjamin DeMott's characterization of her in his article in the December 9, 1978 issue of "The Nation"), Professor Shaughnessy communicated her findings to a wider audience and in a classic work, "Errors and Expectations" (published by the Oxford University Press), a book which DeMott terms in the same article "a social and moral breakthrough". DeMott goes on to say:

> "how many movements, essentially only a few years in intensity, have produced a document by a central figure in the drama - a book so definitive in its exploration of the problems?...What is extraordinary in her work, - and admirably suggestive for the future - is the commitment to the imaginative recreation of the mind of the new academic learner, between purpose, sense of self, and sense of audience..."

DeMott concludes his remarkable tribute to Mina Shaughnessy with one of the most sensitive defenses of Open Admissions that has ever been written:

> "Few will urge that the term remediation carries round it a nimbus of glamour. But to be distracted by the plainness of plain labels is absurd: remediation is intimately connected with the grand project of this society, that of democratic realization... Our duty is to grasp that, because of the character of the society, sometimes even because of its peculiar corruptions, we are placed periodically to advance in knowledge of our brothers and sisters, to feel our way forward into a deeper and more consequential fraternity with one another than hitherto achieved. Caught up in condescension, irony, muckraking, or despair, we often miss the step that our best democratic selves have been attempting, amidst chaos, to learn to take. But such failures of vision need correcting. Leaving them uncorrected, indeed, may well seem to the historian, in the longest run, the only "New York tragedy" worth recording."

Mina Shaughnessy was a remarkable person. Her dedication to the New Student was emulated by all too few faculty colleagues - at least during the early years of Open Admissions (this situation improved considerably in later years). What surprised me even more was the fact that Open Admissions alienated such a vast proportion of City College alumni from their own romance with the ideal of the disadvantaged, a romance dominated by Brilliant Student Superachiever who, for the short period of three decades, made City College a national phenomenon. But most of all, I was exasperated by the CUNY admissions process that was to determine the student body of the Seventies; that is, the process of giving all students the option of their first choice in CUNY without regard to the resulting disproportionate racial bunching of students in the upper high school average ranges in the White borough schools of Queens and Brooklyn and in the relatively "safe" Hunter complex on Manhattan's Park Avenue.

Thus City College, because of its location and perhaps because of its very reputation as the "open access" college among New York's disadvantaged, was selected as the first choice college more often by just those students in the lower high school average ranges who were also members of the poorer Black, Hispanic and immigrant Asian groups in New York. In 1970, for example, City was selected as the first choice college by 2,009 students whose averages were over 85; by 1972, only two years later, this group numbered only 1,167. As I have stated before, this erosion of interest in City College on the part of well-prepared students was accentuated by the failure to understand that Open Admissions was intended to open the doors of the senior colleges to students of high motivation and high rank (upper half of the graduating class) within their own school environments and not to decrease in any way the numbers of well-prepared students permitted to enter City College.

Whatever the reasons and however groundless, City College was overwhelmed by the implementation of the CUNY policy of Open Admissions in September 1970. Sufficient preparation for Open Admissions had not been possible during the Spring of 1970 despite the good will, cooperation, and hard work on the part of nearly everyone concerned. When I arrived in September, I appointed Professor Alan Fiellin as Dean of Special Programs, to coordinate Open Admissions and SEEK. Under his overall direction, a battery of tests in Basic Writing, College Skills, and Mathematics was administered to all entering freshmen. At the same time, the College initiated three programs specifically intended to help the underprepared student: remedial courses to improve the levels of basic skills (Basic Writing, College Skills and Mathematics), attempts to modify the form and content of traditional course offerings, particularly those designed for freshmen, and counseling to orient the underprepared student to the campus generally and specifically to help in the selection of a suitable program of courses in the first and second semesters. The remedial courses were patterned on those developed for the SEEK program in the previous five years. However, it should be pointed out at the outset that the need for the remedial courses, determined by placement tests consistently outran the funds allocated for them so that the size of the remedial sections was more than optimal.

The English Department defined the three-semester sequence in Basic Writing in terms of three levels of expression: English 1 (treating the basic grammatical and mechanical conventions of written English), English 2 (expository writing-culminating in the short essay), English 3 (academic forms - culminating in the long paper). English 3 was the equivalent of a one-semester composition course which had been required of all City College freshmen before 1969 but this requirement had been abolished in 1969 (without knowledge that the Open Admissions policy would go into effect a year later). The English Department also introduced an English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) sequence for non-English-speaking students. The Department developed the placement tests (both objective and essays) to decide which course, if any, of the basic writing sequence would be required of each student. One of the most surprising results was the assignment of 36% of the "Honors" students (students with high school averages above 85%) to remedial English 2 and correspondingly higher figures for students with averages below 85%. While it was acknowledged that there had been a lowering of standards in the public school system of New York City, it was difficult to believe that there had been such a precipitous decline. The figure of 36% became even more suspect when it was compared to the corresponding figure for College Skills, 14% for "Honors" students, where a nationally recognized placement test for college skills, i.e. the Stanford Achievement Test, had been used.

The huge overall percentage (about 90%) of entering freshmen assigned to so-called "remedial English" by the English Department was an embarrassment to the College and became another self-fulfilling prophecy. First, the non-English-speaking students who were academically well-prepared in every other respect, were assigned to ESL, which was designated "remedial English". Other students, advised to take English 3, really the normal freshman English course, were also counted in the total remediation figures. In addition, City College's placement examination in Basic Writing proved to be much more difficult overall than examinations later instituted throughout CUNY under the "Skills Assessment Tests". Many so-called remedial sections at City College were really non-remedial when calibrated against the national average (during one of the years, when a comparison was made, it was found that 40% of the City College students placed in English 2, were above the national average). The confusion between remedial English and "English-as-a-Second Language", the semantical blunder of calling the regular freshman English composition course (English 3) "remedial English", and the greater difficulty of the placement tests, all contributed to the misleading impression that nearly all City College students were taking some form of "remedial English". This loose talk was harmful to the image of the College and gave unnecessary ammunition to the ever-alert critics of the College and of public higher education.

The Mathematics Department offered two remedial sequences: a two-semester sequence for students not majoring in the sciences (Elementary Algebra and Plane Geometry), and a three-semester sequence for students who were majoring in science and related professional areas (Basic Essentials of Algebra and Geometry, Intermediate Algebra and some College Algebra, Trigonometry and Pre-Calculus).

One of the interesting points of comparison was the different approaches taken by the English and Mathematics Departments with regard to the staffing of the remedial courses in Basic Writing and Mathematics respectively. The numbers given here for the Fall of 1971 are taken from a report on the first two years of Open Admissions at City College by Joel Perlman, Coordinator of the Office of Open Admissions under Dean Feillin. Mr. Perlman stated in his report that only 5 of 150 sections of Basic Writing offered in the Fall of 1971 (79% taken by Open Admission students, 21% by SEEK), were taught by the tenured professorial staff in the English Department. The 26 non-tenured Assistant Professors in that Department averaged one section each, nearly all in English 3. Virtually all the remaining sections (almost none of which was English 3) were taught by a team of Instructors and Lecturers, most of whom taught three sections each. Of the 40 or so faculty members involved in the Basic Writing program, only 8 had their Ph.D.'s and 15 were working for their Ph.D.'s. In the case of the Mathematics Department, 90 remedial sections were taught in the Fall of 1971 (72% for Open Admissions students and 28% for SEEK students). The Mathematics Department decided on a diametrically opposed policy to that of the English Department, namely not to hire a special staff to do the remedial work but to spread the remedial teaching load among its entire faculty. The senior faculty carried proportionately only a slightly lighter share of the total remedial sections and tutoring work than the lower ranks. The divergent paths taken by the English and Mathematics Departments to staff its remedial courses may have been responsible for several significant developments in later years.

At this point, I note that the Chairman of the English Department during the early years of Open Admissions was Professor Theodore Gross, whom I later appointed Dean of Humanities of the College of Arts and Science and who published the article "How to Kill a College" in the Saturday Review (February 4, 1978). In The Saturday Review article, Professor Gross wrote:

> "In May 1970, I was elected chairman of an English department composed of 125 full-time people and a range of part-time professors: visiting poets, novelists, and journalists. By the end of August as a consequence of the open admissions policy, I had hired 21 additional full-time faculty members to teach what we called basic writing. Within a year, open admissions greatly altered our educational mission. A department that had offered 70 percent of its courses in literature and the rest in some form of basic written composition now offered the reverse...The faculty experienced a shock of cultural recognition...the older professors who struggled to teach sentence fragments were scarcely appeased; they would not change.

The younger faculty - those whom I had hired in late August - were indeed writing dissertations on Spenser, and their graduate studies pulled them away from the hard reality of their teaching; they were academic schizophrenics, holding what seemed to be two opposing ideas - literacy and literature - in their mind at the same time..."

This quotation conjures up a vision of the tenured professorial faculty of the English Department at City College subjected to a horrendous cultural shock in trying to teach basic writing to large numbers of Open Admissions students (something that was actually done by the tenured professorial faculty of the Mathematics Department without too much intellectual damage). However, when Professor Gross's statements are placed beside the aforementioned Perlman report, (unless the statistics are different between the Fall of 1970 and the Fall of 1971 - which I doubt), I can not understand why the teaching of 5 of 150 remedial sections (3.3%!) by the tenured professorial staff should have produced so much trauma in the English Department. Furthermore, 80% of the instruction in English 1 and English 2 (English 3 was not, by any stretch of the imagination, a remedial course) was done by persons who were not yet Spenserian scholars (i.e. with Ph.D.'s); these basic writing teachers were receiving excellent pay for a reasonable number of hours per week in a job not unrelated to their profession and could devote the rest of their time to writing their theses or whatever else was of interest to them. Perhaps, if more members of the tenured professorial faculty in the English Department had occasional contact with the students in the Basic Writing course, they would have inspired some of the students to major in English or a related field, slowing the decline of student interest in the humanities.

I have gone into some detail concerning the two critical startup years of the Open Admissions program, namely during the academic years 1970-71 and 1971-72. It should be reiterated that the SEEK program - which had been originated at City College in 1965 - had attained its full complement of 2000 students, by far the largest SEEK student body in CUNY. However, of the 2000 students, 600 took their classes in converted rooms in a mid-Manhattan hotel, called the Alamac Hotel, and led a separate existence from the student body on the Uptown campus. The Alamac SEEK program had been started as a "residence experiment" under the jurisdiction of CUNY Central but a series of crises over a period of years led CUNY Central to assign responsibility for the Alamac SEEK program to City College a year before my arrival. It soon became apparent that it was educationally wise to move the 600 students at the Alamac to the Uptown Campus. This was accomplished by September 1971 after some difficult negotiations with Alamac's recalcitrant faculty. After September 1971, the total SEEK enrollment at City College was stabilized at 2000.

Parenthetically, I always thought that the Alamac SEEK negotiations constituted a triumph for the "persuasive" approach to college decision-making and governance that I had advocated just two years earlier at the University of Rochester. This was contrary to the "hard-line" approach being pressed upon me by a small number of "hawkish" faculty (who, not unsurprisingly, were strong opponents of the Open Admissions policy). What happened was that the City College Provost during the academic year 1970-71 (Abraham Schwartz of the Mathematics Department) had studied the Alamac situation in mid-year and had recommended the transfer of the Alamac SEEK program to the Uptown campus. This recommendation was vehemently opposed by the Alamac faculty - a self-contained group of about 60 persons - who had become accustomed to a fairly independent existence at the Alamac Hotel. The faculty group at the Alamac tried to persuade the 600 students assigned there that the status quo was more beneficial for their education than their integration with the 1400 SEEK students on campus. I held several meetings with the faculty group but these only led to emotional exchanges of views and intensified organizational activities among the students. Finally, I worked out an agreement with the spokesperson for the Alamac faculty that the President's Policy Advisory Council (consisting of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, its counterpart in the two Student Senates (Day and Evening), and all the deans - giving comparable voice to faculty, students and administration) would devote an entire meeting to the pros and cons of the move and that I would abide by majority vote. After a lengthy discussion, in which a self-selected delegation of faculty and students from the Alamac participated, the vote of the Policy Advisory Council (including all representatives of the Student Senates) went unanimously in favor of the move. This settled the matter and City College then absorbed on its campus all students and faculty from the Alamac who wished to join its ranks (and that was the overwhelming majority). In later years, the spokesperson for the Alamac faculty, who served City College most effecitvely in a variety of ways, acknowledged that the Alamac move was a correct one.

Despite the opposition of a vocal minority of faculty, the College developed a qualified, dedicated and experienced staff in the implementation of Open Admissions policy. The three parts of the remedial program: Basic Writing, College Skills and Mathematics, were genuinely helpful to large numbers of Open Admissions students. The hope was also sustained that as problems and potentialities were defined, as faculty awareness and experience grew, concerned and innovative members of the faculty would make significant contributions to the College's overall effort. By the end of the 1970-71 academic year, the College realized that it could not drop students into one or two remedial courses, confident that they would emerge able to cope with all the challenges that students encounter at City College.

In its second year of Open Admissions, 1971-72, City College began to correct some of the major flaws that appeared in its initial 1970-71 effort. The reforms, however, revealed the limits of organizational improvements in the face of budgetary stringencies and incredible numbers of students in need of remedial services. The counseling and placement system was improved with far more order in the initial contact of the College with Open Admissions students; thus, there were many fewer cases of mismatching of students with courses or credit loads. There was, however, a problem in giving sufficient "motivational" credits to students taking a full remedial load while a paucity of federal work-study money caused considerable financial distress for Open Admissions students (compared to SEEK students).

There were a number of curricular innovations for the Open Admissions and SEEK students, Several departments developed special courses or course sequences, to help the poorly prepared Open Admissions students over their initial college hurdles. In the Chemistry Department, a special introductory sequence of courses was designed to teach in three semesters what was formerly taught in two. This sequence, which received national attention, and a newly developed physics course of similar conception, attempted to restructure the presentation of material, insofar as it was possible, to enable students to begin chemistry and physics while they were still in the mathematics remedial courses.

Still other curricular adaptations and experiments were tried. One of the most impressive was the freshman interdisciplinary program, a small-scale pilot attempt to completely restructure the freshman year at the College. The program was based on the integration of skills and content courses and of several content areas with one another. A team-teaching approach was employed and counselors were intimately involved so that the student's academic development was not treated as if it existed in a vacuum. The first attempt at this integrated freshman program was mounted in the Spring, 1972 semester with three core courses (History, Political Science, Psychology), basic writing and college skills. Faculty actively concerned with the Open Admissions effort also explored the benefits and opportunities for instructional technology in supporting the underprepared student. These positive outgrowths of the Open Admissions policy came to fruition under some of the most trying physical conditions to which a college population could be subjected: makeshift facilities, unusable space, overcrowded classrooms, understaffing -- all dictated by budgetary restrictions.

At the end of the third year of Open Admissions at City College, a report prepared by Leslie Berger, an Associate Dean at CUNY Central, judged that during the previous two years, the College had corrected most of the major flaws that had appeared in its initial 1970-71 effort. In particular, the Mathematics Department's program, assisted by sizeable staff and space support from the College, became the backbone of a large number of minority assistance programs in the science and engineering departments. Indeed, in many ways, City College in this respect became a model for the country (see §2 below).

During the following two years, the College continued to build on the strengths of its Open Admissions program, and succeeded in further refining its approach to underskilled students. The writing and math programs were among the best in CUNY. The interdisciplinary approach to remediation, which combined skills training with the content of a regular course, appeared to be an effective way of bridging the gap between remediation and entering the mainstream of college education. City College was trying to implement with the utmost seriousness its commitment to Goal 1 of the Urban Educational Model.

Let me conclude this section with some general statements about the achievements and shortcomings of Open Admissions. One must first acknowledge that the Open Admissions experience brought about invaluable educational changes at the College. Many of the remedial programs added measurably to the College's ability to bring poorly prepared high school students through the difficult transition to the intellectual demands of a college education that would meet traditional graduation requirements. The relaxation of "entrance" requirements was not accompanied in any significant fashion by a relaxation of "exit" requirements. What is true is that the attrition rate before graduation increased substantially - especially in the freshman and sophomore years - not a surprising result if graduation standard were to be maintained. Contrary to the fears of many alumni, the value of a City College degree was not depreciated by Open Admissions. I do not wish to give the impression that alumni sentiment with regard to Open Admissions was uniformly negative. Key alumni not only understood the moral and human issues involved in the Open Admissions policy in City University but also appreciated its socio-economic significance. One of these alumni was Dr. Herbert Bienstock, Head of the New York Office of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, who, in a speech in April 1975 to the New York City Council of Economic Education, said:

> "This investment in Open Admissions is going to produce a population that consumes fewer services and earns more income, and will give us a head start on the manpower needs of the coming 'knowledge society'."

Looking back over the College's handling of Open Admissions during the period 1970-76, the experiment must be judged a success. Given the emergency conditions under which Open Admissions was instituted, the constant underfunding of the program, the lack of experience of faculty dealing with large numbers of underprepared students, the economic, physical and social handicaps of the students, the problems of over-crowding on campus, the constant sniping by a vocal minority of the faculty, the disproportionate burden assigned to City College through CUNY's allocation policies, the College not only survived Open Admissions but showed how to turn it to academic innovation as well as social good.

In any discussion of CUNY's Open Admissions policy, it is important to remember that the policy was only an innovation for CUNY. Open admissions in other formats had been implemented successfully in many other American institutions of higher learning, in some cases for nearly a century. The state university system in California -- the largest institution of higher learning in the country -- as well as the land-grant colleges had been offering "open access" to all high school graduates for many decades. In California, all 18 year olds - even those without a high school diploma - can enter a community college. Controversy over the policy in those institutions was minimal, faculty were accepting and cooperative. The reputation of one of the great state universities does not depend on the admission of underprepared students who cannot cope with the college curriculum and who drop out, but rather on the quality of those students who are graduated by the system. Why then all the commotion over CUNY's policy of "open access"? Why, in fact, was Open Admissions declared a failure and a disaster by many New Yorkers before the first Open Admissions class ever reached upper division status?

The elements which complicated the implementation of Open Admissions policy in New York are too numerous for adequate discussion here. One might, however, briefly mention a few of them. Time was certainly a complicating factor: the College and CUNY simply could not move proper mechanisms into place sufficiently fast to prepare for the greatly augmented influx of students. The haste with which the policy descended upon the CUNY system allowed little time to prepare faculty, alumni, and others to accept, even to understand, the reasons for the new model of operation. Attitudes of educational elitism, and even a certain amount of latent racism, were operating as well - although, curiously, as I have mentioned above, White fears of a Black takeover of the city's colleges were unfounded, since the majority of those availing themselves of Open Admissions were White. Fears that graduation standards would be severely lowered with Open Admissions also proved to be unfounded. Perhaps, in addition to the serious budgetary restrictions, one of the most difficult problems confronting the College was the presence on the faculty of all too many who were unable or unwilling to adjust themselves quickly to the remedial effort, but who, for one reason or another, went about business as usual, with unproductive results in the classroom.

It must be reiterated that a major distinguishing feature of the Open Admissions policy at CUNY which differentiated it from other American institutions, where the policy had been implemented for many years, was the commitment of CUNY to ensure that the Open Admissions policy would represent an "open door" rather than a "revolving door". Elsewhere, students, who were admitted but who failed to measure up to standards, were dropped without further ado. At CUNY, the objective of the effort was to provide as much remediation, counseling and tutoring as the budget would permit in order to maximize the possibility of success. In fact, CUNY succeeded in this intent during the early years of Open Admissions. A report on the first two years of Open Admissions at CUNY noted that the retention rate of students enrolled under the policy was significantly higher than anticipated: 7 out of 10 students who had enrolled in the Fall of 1970 were still enrolled in 1973. Predictions that Open Admissions would become a fast "revolving door" with a huge dropout rate simply did not materialize. This is not to say that optimal conditions for the success of Open Admissions prevailed in the CUNY system. Dr. Seymour Weisman, Executive Vice President of the City College Alumni Association, gave a balanced set of suggestions in the City College "Alumnus" (October 1974) for achieving this optimization:

> "To implement this goal (of Open Admissions) requires meaningful and effective cooperation between many diverse sources - adequate financing by elected officials, intelligent educational leadership from the Board of Higher Education, joint ventures with the Board of Education in formulating common educational policy, faculty commitment to open admissions, student motivation for academic achievement and community understanding and support."

§2 Modified Open Admissions (1976-)

During the first few years of Open Admissions, CUNY's budget grew substantially to meet at least partially the instructional (if not the counseling and tutorial) needs of the large numbers of Open Admissions students who were entering the system. In addition, several physical master plans were approved by Albany (e.g. those of City College and Hunter College) to provide vastly improved and new facilities and amenities for the students attending the public colleges of New York City. With free tuition maintained and an independent Board of Higher Education, it did appear as if New York State had adopted a sympathetic stance to a City University struggling with all its energies to implement a difficult, controversial and far-reaching change in its educational philosophy. However, this posture did not last. In January 1972, Governor Nelson Rockefeller called for an end to CUNY's 125 year-old tradition of free tuition and the absorption of CUNY into the SUNY system. From then on, there was an annual drive in Albany to impose tuition on the full-time undergraduates of CUNY's senior colleges (tuition for the part-time undergraduates had been in existence for years and tuition for graduate students in the CUNY system exceeded that in the SUNY system), an annual attempt to reduce the independent status of the CUNY system, and increasing reluctance to support CUNY's budget. Each year, it was necessary to mobilize all the constituencies of the CUNY system - students, faculty, alumni and administrators - to make the pilgramage to Albany to persuade either the legislative branch of the state government and/or the executive branch to preserve a vital and free CUNY, responsive to the needs of its students and to the needs of New York City.

The arguments for the imposition of tuition were given in the name of economy but, in my view, were political in character. Any objective analysis of the economics of the situation showed that most of the students in the CUNY system came from such low income families that their tuition would be paid by a combination of the federal and state tuition assistance programs. In a word, for these students, the imposition of tuition would merely involve the transfer of funds from one branch of government to another at the expense of an enormous amount of paperwork. Moreover, most of the federal and state tuition assistance was only available for a period of four years and this time constraint went contrary to the pattern of a slower rate of progress towards graduation at City College and other units of the CUNY system because of academic deficiencies, part-time jobs and other problems. Consequently, tuition charges would effectively curtail the opportunities for higher education for thousands of young people from working class families. The imposition of tuition would also have a deleterious effect on the enrollment of students from lower middle and middle class families because the pegging of tuition - as proposed - to the SUNY level would make CUNY much less attractive for a college education. With small additional financial support - either from families or part-time work - many of these students could enroll in the SUNY system and enjoy the vastly superior facilities and amenities to those of CUNY. (As indicated, improved facilities and amenities for CUNY students were projected at the beginning of the Seventies but have not yet come to realization - see Chapter 8). The loss of thousands of these lower middle and middle class students from the CUNY system would undermine the social mission of the public sector of higher education in New York City which is to maintain a balanced academic, ethnic and class mix in its student body.

Insofar as arguments for a separate CUNY system were concerned, they were aimed at preserving Open Admissions in the University and the specifically New York City - centered urban mission of the CUNY system. The SUNY system of Open Admissions relied on the admission of a student with a low high school average into a community college near the student's home. If the student successfully attained the community college degree, he or she could then transfer to one of SUNY's senior colleges or to one of the four University centers in the State, all of which have dormitories. In New York City, however, the availability of the senior colleges by subway, and the volatile issue of turning community colleges into racial ghettos supported the argument that - under suitable conditions - students be permitted to enroll as freshmen in CUNY's senior colleges if they planned to work for the bachelor's degree. Equal weight had to be given to the argument that New York City was really so different from upper New York State that the merging of CUNY into the SUNY system would greatly diminish CUNY's visibility and effectiveness as the humanizing institutional agent for upward mobility in an ever-changing city.

By and large, the annual budgetary battles were won by CUNY and its friends until the 1975-76 academic year when the serious fiscal crisis plaguing both city and state finally forced the BHE to impose tuition and to reduce the numbers of entering students by tightening admissions requirements to the senior colleges. The reaction at City College brought a brief flashback to the era of confrontation in 1969. A group of students occupied the College's Administration Building protesting against threatened tuition charges and budgetary cuts. Objectionable as this action was - it was rapidly defused - still more irresponsible was the decision to end the 129 year-old tradition of free higher education at the City University. Tuition was imposed at the same level as SUNY, and entrance requirements for the senior colleges underwent a change from the upper half of the graduating class to the upper third being required for admission, while the alternative of a minimum of an 80% high school average was maintained. This modification of official "Open Admissions" policy no more heralded the end of the historic "open access" tradition of City College and CUNY, as some charged, than the "Open Admissions" policy of 1970 meant a guaranteed place in a senior college for every high school graduate in New York City. Moreover, CUNY remained independent of the SUNY system.

The combination of tuition charges and the "Modified Open Admissions" policy, both starting in September 1976, had major effects on City College. The decline in student enrollment was much more drastic than had been anticipated with the imposition of tuition since the potential pool of students was decreased by the raising of admission standards under the Modified Open Admissions policy. Several colleges in the CUNY system (John Jay, Lehman and York) sought to lessen the impact of reduced student enrollment by seeking, and securing, a special dispensation from the BHE to lower the minimum entering high school average, from 80% to 75%, to increase their pool of applicants. City College chose not to travel this path but to try to reverse the decline in student enrollment by promoting the excellence of more of the academic programs which already existed and by creating some new programs (particularly in the liberal arts where the enrollment decline had been the steepest) that would attract entering freshmen and transfer students back to City College.

It is interesting to compare the figures for the second "Open Admissions" class entering in September 1971 with the second "Modified Open Admissions" class entering in September 1977. The

1971 entering freshman class consisted of approximately 3200 students, of which about 2800 were regular students and about 400 SEEK students, whereas the 1977 entering freshman class consisted of approximately 1500 students, of which about 1000 were regular students and about 500 were SEEK students. The ethnic breakdown of the 1971 and 1977 entering freshman classes (exluding SEEK) is given in Table 5.

Table 5

Ethnic Breakdown of the 1971 and 1977 Entering Freshman Classes (Excluding SEEK)

	Black	Puerto Rican	Oriental	White & Other
1971	19%	7%	7%	67%
1977	31%	16%	9%	44%

The other effect of the combination of tuition charges and the 'Modified Open Admissions' policy was a change in the academic profile of entering, non-SEEK freshman, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6

High School Average (HSA) Breakdown of the 1971 and 1977 Entering Freshman Classes (Excluding SEEK)

	≥90%	85-89.9	80-84.9	70-79.9	Below 70%
1971	4%	13%	28%	51%	4%
1977	18%	23%	35%	22%	2%

The figures in Table 6 speak for themselves. While it was generally believed that there had been some decline in the standards for high school graduation (although the evidence was by no means convincing), Table 6 does imply a reduced need for remediation among non-SEEK students since 1976 both relatively and, obviously, in absolute numbers (because of declining enrollment).

One of the remarkable developments at City College after 1976, at least among certain segments of the faculty, was their rededication to the historic humanistic mission of the College and the reinvigoration of their commitment to meet the diverse learning and career needs of the multi-ethnic student body enrolled at City College. While welcoming the reduced remedial needs of the entering freshman since 1976 (under the "Modified Open Admissions" policy), these faculty began to explore other ways in which their acquired expertise in overcoming the academic deficiencies of underprepared students could be put to use in enhancing student performance at the College, overcoming skills deficiencies at the pre-college level, and guiding minority students into undergraduate research and graduate research areas that had traditionally been avoided (e.g. in science, engineering and biomedicine). The number of such programs grew rapidly after 1976 and it is highly gratifying that the reduced commitment by city and state to provide higher educational opportunities for the "children of the poor, immigrant and disadvantaged" was, in some sense, compensated for by the increased commitment on the part of substantial numbers of City College faculty.

A half dozen examples will illustrate the types of open access programs that were undertaken during the latter part of the Seventies through the wise use of faculty expertise and college resources developed in response to the challenge of Open Admissions during the first part of the Seventies (most of the financial support from these programs came from an assortment of federal agencies):

1. Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) Program: supporting minority undergraduate students who wished to pursue graduate work in the biomedical areas, the MARC program provided stipends and research support and allowed students to work on collaborative projects with faculty members.

2. Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP): provided a more effective response to student learning needs in the first-level science and engineering courses and offered individualized instructional materials and methods to supplement the traditional lecture-recitational presentations. The goal was to improve the success rate of these students and thereby encourage more minority students to pursue advanced courses and science careers.

3. Bridge to Medicine Program: prepared economically and educationally disadvantaged high school seniors for entry into either the Biomedical Program or other rigorous pre-medical programs.

4. Boys' Harbor Projects: working in liaison with Boys' Harbor, a social service organization, the College conducted instructional programs (lectures and laboratory work) aimed at helping minority students from junior high and high schools to improve their knowledge of mathematics, biology and chemistry. The program's ultimate goal was to motivate these students to pursue careers in science.

5. Select Program in Science and Engineering (SPISE): for 10 Saturdays each semester, 240 minority students from eight high schools visited the College to hear lectures on mathematics and work on motivational activities in the science and engineering laboratories. The program also included other motivational and counseling sessions, all designed to encourage the economically and educationally disadvantaged 10th graders to seek careers in science and engineering.

6. Mathematics Development Program for Secondary School Teachers: under this program, 100 teachers of high school mathematics from a four-state area (including New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Connecticut) came to the College for special advanced courses taught by members of the mathematics department. The math classes were followed by education seminars in which the mathematics course content was related to the secondary school classroom.

The above examples represent only a small part of faculty effort devoted to what I like to designate as the "Open Access" mission of City College. As I pondered the proliferation of these programs and the many more opportunities being offered to minority students to embark on careers in science, engineering and biomedicine, it occurred to me that the previous SEEK guidelines made it difficult for SEEK students (most of whom were from the minority communities) to take advantage of the newly-created educational opportunities at City College. By insisting that eligibility for the SEEK program (with its benefits of more extensive counseling and tutorial services as well as stipends) required not only economic disadvantagement but also academic disadvantagement (high school average less than 80%), SEEK students were basically being denied the enriched educational opportunities for minority students at City College. I therefore proposed a change in the SEEK guidelines which was supported by Dean George McDonald (Director of the City College SEEK program) and which won acceptance at CUNY Central. The new SEEK guidelines contained the proviso:

> "(A percentage) of the total number of SEEK freshmen spaces to be allocated to each campus shall be available for recruitment of students by the campus for special and highly competitive programs, with such special eligibility requirements for the particular campus program as may be approved by the Chancellor..."

This proviso permited a certain percentage (perhaps 10%) of academically superior but economically poor minority students to profit from the "special and highly competitive programs" at City College.

I should like to conclude this section by mentioning two other projects which were triggered by the College's efforts to meet the challenge of Open Admissions and which were consonant with the spirit of the Urban Educational

Model, namely the Center for Academic Skills (CAS) and the Campus High School. The creation of CAS was recommended in the Anderson Report in 1974 (discussed in Chapter 2) but it was not established until 1976 with the initial funding supplied by the IBM Corporation. The Center for Academic Skills became the vehicle for coordinating the College's many activities dedicated to the education of its under-prepared students: small-size remedial and developmental classes, courses integrating skills instruction and subject matter, modularized learning sequences that emphasize mastery learning, individualized counseling and tutorial assistance, computer-assisted instruction, and learning laboratories. CAS itself made a commitment to fundamental research into the causes of skills disadvantagement, the development of pedagogic strategies designed to facilitate learning, the general improvement of teaching in the area of academic skills, and the evaluation and dissemination of its findings to a wide audience increasingly concerned with these problems. A "Journal of Academic Skills" was established to provide a forum for the exchange of information, views and experiences in this under-researched field.

The second project finally came to fruition during the last year of my presidency and exemplified in a gratifying way Goal 1 of the Urban Educational Model, namely "to promote the widespread diffusion of skills and knowledge by reaching out to students of all ages, backgrounds and degrees of preparation". This project was the Campus High School, to which the name A. Philip Randolph Campus High School was given when it was officially established in September 1979. It took eight years of protracted negotiations between City College and three Chancellors of the Board of Education, three mayors, teachers' unions, supervisors' unions, and the City Council to bring to realization the A. Philip Randolph High School. The project almost died aborning on several occasions due to the fiscal exigencies of New York City but City College simply would not let go because of the enormous potential it saw in this operation (the second Chancellor of the Board of Education involved in the drawn-out negotiations - Irving Anker - once wrote to me that he was convinced that the Campus High School would be "a major innovation in American education"). I can relate only part of the story here but I do believe that in this instance the delays can be attributed to the harshness of external circumstance and not to the normal bureaucratic impediments.

The story really starts in August 1968 - before Buell Gallagher had even resigned the City College presidency - when the BHE passed a resolution to take effect in the academic year 1969-70 that would permit CUNY to:

> "select initially at least five public high schools in New York City from among those schools which exhibit the greatest degree of disadvantage as measured by such factors as the proportion of students earning general diplomas, the percentage of students reading below grade level, the attrition rate, the proportion of students residing in officially designated poverty areas, and similar measures...The University shall petition the Board of Education of the City of New York and the Board of Regents of the State of New York for complete operational control of and jurisdiction over these schools and, if granted, each of these high schools shall be associated with a unit or units, of the City University. All graduates of these high schools earning at least a 70% high school average shall be admitted as matriculated students in the associated City University unit or units."

In a way, this was a generalization of the "prep school" concept to public higher education in New York City but the South Campus occupation in April 1969 put this resolution on the "back burner" (at a later date the LaGuarda Community College implemented the spirit of this resolution but no senior college did until the establishment of the A. Philip Randolph Campus High School at City College). It is interesting to note that the BHE repeated its exhortation in January 1973 for close cooperation between CUNY and the public high schools by stating that:

"1. The University should pursue its undertaking to operate five high schools under terms which will permit educational and administrative innovation and creativity.

2. Joint master planning between City University and the secondary school system should be promoted and advanced.

3. The University should play a key role in upgrading pre-collegiate academic preparation.

4. The University should explore with the Board of Education the sharing of physical facilities and the sharing of information with respect to students."

(The Hunter College High School is a full-fledged "prep school" and operates from Hunter's budget; the BHE concept was closer to the model of the old Townsend Harris High School which was supported by the Board of Education and cooperated programmatically with City College.)

During my first year as president, I became aware of the earlier BHE resolution but in the absence of a high school in the proximity of City College (one of the complaints of the Harlem community was that there was no high school in Central Harlem and there was growing sentiment to persuade the Board of Education to build a new Harlem High School), there was not much that the College could do. The situation became more interesting in the Fall of 1971 when Doyle Bortner (Dean of the City College School of Education) came to my office, accompanied by Dr. Richard Klein, principal of the High School of Music and Art (the High School of Music and Art is on the City College campus and architecturally integrated with it). Dr. Klein informed us that the Board of Education had decided to combine the High School of Music and Art and the High School of Performing Arts (located in Lower Manhattan) into a single new LaGuardia High School adjacent to Lincoln Center. While the completion date for the new LaGuardia High School was several years off, Dean Bortner and I could immediately visualize the exciting educational possibilities inherent in an experimental (campus) high school jointly administered by the Board of Education and City College and housed in the vacated (and still well-preserved) Music and Art Building. It was clear to Dean Bortner and myself at the outset that the Campus High School would have to pursue two simultaneous objectives (just as City College was attempting to meet the twin challenges of equal educational opportunity and academic excellence): to create and test a series of model curricula aimed at overcoming academic skills deficiencies at the secondary level and to provide opportunities for well-qualified students to relate to the broad variety of City College programs in both the liberal arts and professional studies.

Dean Bortner soon headed up a faculty committee to develop a preliminary curricular design for the Campus High School. I also empowered him to carry on negotiations with the Board of Education, the teachers' unions and the Harlem community. Negotiations with the Board of Education and the teachers' unions preceeded slowly but reasonably well. However, some persons operating a private high school in a storefront in Harlem at that time, argued that the Music and Art Building be turned over to them for its own program, when it became available, and demanded that the College drop out of the picture. (This high school storefront operation was not Harlem Prep, which had also started out as a storefront operation to prepare minority youngsters for college and had done so well under Dr. Edward Carpenter's leadership that its budget had become the responsibility of the Board of Education.) We offered to place several persons associated with this high school storefront operation on the Planning Committee to see whether a mutually-agreed-upon plan could be worked out for the Campus High School (whereby, for example, the storefront operation would affiliate with the Campus High School) but our offer was turned down. At that point, the disagreement became moot when the new LaGuardia High School was eliminated from New York City's capital budget. This meant that the High School of Music and Art would have to remain on the City College campus and it seemed that the project had received its first coup de grace.

In a strenuous attempt to save the project, I consulted my Special Assistant for Minority Affairs, Ms. Dorothy Gordon. She suggested that City College send a representative to urge the (New York) City Council to restore LaGuardia High School to the capital budget so that the College could proceed with the Campus High School and realize for the Harlem community some of the benefits that a Harlem High School (that clearly was not going to be built) could achieve. I took her advice and asked her to attend a City Council budget hearing as the College representative, subject to coordination with Chancellor Harvey Scribner of the Board of Education. Ms. Gordon was so effective in her testimony that the LaGuardia High School was restored to the capital budget. The High School of Music and Art faculty and principal reacted with great joy, and the Campus High School project had its first rebirth.

Dean Bortner proceeded to negotiate an agreement with the Board of Education and the teachers' unions (by then the larger Harlem community had begun to indicate its support for the Campus High School), and we appointed Dr. Joshua Smith from the Ford Foundation as Professor in the School of Education to take charge of the project. Professor Smith and his Curricular Design Committee produced many interesting documents; I quote from one paragraph which spells out the philosophical framework within which the curriculum for the Campus High School was being designed:

> "It is our premise that adolescents in an urban community bring to the school setting a wide variety of individual strengths (including learning and communication styles, value systems, and problem-solving abilities) and that a major goal of urban education is to find better methods of recognizing these strengths and capitalizing upon them so that the strengths might be effectively transferred to the academic setting. Implicit in this concept is the view that a uniform model of education will not meet the needs of all students. Individual and cultural differences (in priorities, concerns, and needs) should be recognized and respected, and each student should be encouraged to maximize and develop his own full and unique potential..."

Within this framework, the Smith Committee proposed dividing the students in the Campus High School into clusters or families, each of which would have its own team of teachers in various subjects. Basic skills would be emphasized during the first two years and career education - including heavy concentration on college preparation for those who anticipated professional or academic careers - during the last two years.

The Smith Committee was making excellent progress and as late as March 1975, the city's decision to construct the new LaGuardia High School was reaffirmed. Within one year, as the city's fiscal crisis gathered momentum, this reaffirmation was withdrawn and by the Summer of 1976, LaGuardia High School was again off the city's capital budget. This blow had the smell of fatality about it but now Chancellor Anker, who had succeeded Chancellor Scribner, came to the rescue. He had become so intrigued with the potential national significance of the Campus High School project that he started to search for ways in which the High School of Music and Art could be moved from its location on the City College campus so that the Campus High School could start operations in the vacated building. Without going into the rather dramatic details, suffice to say that Chancellor Anker's proposed solution was presented at a public hearing of the Board of Education after Mayor Koch's election in November 1977. It was now the turn of the principal, faculty and parents of the High School of Music and Art to spring into action. They had given up hope for the new LaGuardia High School but they seized upon Chancellor Anker's evident interest in the Campus High School, and engaged in a brilliant political maneuver, persuading Mayor-Designate Koch to promise to restore the LaGuardia High School (at Lincoln Center) to the capital budget despite the city's fiscal stringency. Mayor Koch kept his promise and so the story had a happy ending for City College when the new Chancellor of the Board of Education, Frank Macchiarola, took office in September 1978 and gave his support to the agreement between City College and the Board of Education creating the Campus High School.

And so, after eight long years, the A. Philip Randolph Campus High School started operating on September 1, 1979 - just one day after my departure from City College - in temporary campus accommodations, until the Music and Art Building was vacated (which was supposed to be in about two years). The initial class was approximately 300 9th grade youngsters, and it was anticipated that the student population of the A. Philip Randolph High School would attain its peak of about 1500 students after four or five years. I believe that the Campus High School should present an unusual challenge and opportunity for City College, particularly for its School of Education and its College of Liberal Arts and Science. It is my understanding that CUNY has emulated the City College campus high school model and has set up similar arrangements between Queens College and a junior high school in Queens and between Lehman College and an elementary school in the Bronx.

§3 Open Warfare

I have labelled this section "Open Warfare" because of the enormous amount of controversy generated by the policy of Open Admissions instituted at City College (and the rest of City University) at the beginning of the Seventies. One could make up a decent-sized anthology -- though, perhaps, one of rather limited appeal -- of articles, news reports, special TV features (like "Sixty Minutes"), even books, alternatively lauding and damning City College and CUNY for Open Admissions. The majority of the attacks usually revealed, to anyone familiar with the implementation of the Open Admissions policy, a malicious blend of misrepresentation and inaccuracy.

It is interesting to note that the original opponents of Open Admissions did not lessen their attacks when the Open Admissions policy was modified to tighten admissions requirements as a result of the city's fiscal crisis. The combination of tuition charges and the "Modified Open Admissions policy" commencing in September 1976 dealt a crippling blow to student enrollment at City College and many other units of CUNY, and the massive retrenchment, primarily of younger faculty (and staff) - in order to save tenure for the academic departments - lowered the morale of the faculty who stayed and made the campus fertile ground for controversy. In this grim situation, which had much to do with the city's fiscal crisis and very little to do with Open Admissions, the early antagonists of Open Admissions were joined by some new recruits from the liberal arts faculty who blamed declining student enrollment in liberal arts at City College - a national trend - on Open Admissions. These faculty critics, assisted by a group of alumni, triggered a spate of media attacks on the College during the period 1977-78. In what follows, I shall mention some of the commentaries concerning Open Admissions both before 1976, when it was in full operation, and after 1976 when it became the "Modified Open Admissions" policy.

Quite early in the history of Open Admissions - after the first year, to be exact, Nathan Glazer wrote an article on "City College" for a book edited by Davis Riesman and Verne Stadtman entitled Academic Transformation. Among the many percaptive statements in this article, I shall quote one which sets the tone for this section:

> "Marshak was committed to the open enrollment plan (appointed after the Board of Higher Education had made its commitment he had to be), but began his work as President with a deeply divided faculty, many of whom opposed open enrollment and felt it had been shoved down their throats..."

Actually, after some initial hesitation, the majority of the faculty adopted an attitude of "benevolent neutrality" so that Open Admissions could at least receive a fair trial. However, there were a few others, led by Professors Howard Adelson and Stanley Page of the History Department, Professor Louis Heller of the Department of Classics and Hebrew, and Professor Geoffrey Wagner of the English Department, who opposed Open Admissions (even when it became "Modified Open Admissions") throughout the nine years of my presidency.

Identifying with the "old City College" that was portrayed as an institution of student superachievers and distinguished faculty scholars , these four faculty members mounted a campaign against Open Admissions which took on a variety of forms. Professor Adelson seemed the spokesman and polemicist of the group - talking to a syndicated columnist here, speaking on a podium there, and keeping up a constant stream of articles with sensational titles like "City College - an Academic Catastrophe". Professors Heller and Wagner, I saw as the intellectual leaders of the group each publishing one book which purported to be an analysis of the problems of American higher education during the Seventies but which I thought was basically a denunciation of Open Admissions at City College. Professor Heller's book, published in 1973, was entitled The Death of the American University: with Special Reference to the Collapse of City College of New York . Professor Wagner's book, published in 1976, was entitled The End of Education (and could have had the same subtitle as Heller's book!). Professor Page added a humorous and unpredictable tone to the apparently well-coordinated attacks by these four faculty members on Open Admissions, the College and, finally, the President. I believe that the quotations further on will justify my characterizations.

The "open warfare" started four months after my arrival - before the first semester was over - when the syndicated columnists Evans and Novak published a piece in newspapers around the country entitled, "The Effect of Open Enrollment." The piece began with the following scenario:

> "Utterly baffled by the profundities of a first-year history course at City College of New York (CCNY), a newly enrolled freshman this fall told his professor he simply could not make sense out of the textbook, "because too many words are just too long." Such a heart-rendering incident could not have occurred in years past. Such a student would have been academically ineligible for CCNY, the tuition-free college ranking among the nation's best liberal arts schools. Under the new open-admissions policy, however, anybody in the city with a high school diploma can enter City University of New York (CUNY), a sprawling educational complex of junior and senior colleges (including CCNY) and graduate schools..."

(Note that CCNY and CUNY were juxtaposed and the average reader could easily confuse the two and think that under Open Admissions, any high school graduate could enter City College.)

Ignoring the danger of a general argument based on a single incident (ab uno disce omnes), and the facts (the student was born in Greece and had been inadvertently enrolled in the wrong history course), Evans and Novak proceeded to describe faculty complaints about bewildered freshmen. "To be perfectly frank", History Professor Howard Adelson told us (Evans and Novak), "there are indications that this college is finished as a learned institution" (mind you, this is only four months after the start of Open Admissions). Professor Heller added his gem for the readers of the Evans and Novak column: "Open enrollment - a political device for conferring a college degree without giving a college education". With quotations from two faculty "insiders", Evans and Novak were well-armed to conclude their piece (entitled "The Wrecking of a College") with the doomsday statement: "In the months and years ahead the cost to higher education of egalitarianism run wild may be incalculable".

In an action that became typical during my presidency, the Faculty Senate colleagues of Professors Adelson and Heller overwhelmingly passed a resolution critical of the Evans and Novak column:

> "In a syndicated column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, headed "Crisis at CUNY," published in the New York Post on December 29, 1970, the effect of the open admissions policy at CUNY is unfairly discussed and prematurely criticized. The open admissions policy imposes many personal, social and academic challenges. Experiments in education, as in all other areas, demand time, patience and commitment. The Faculty Senate of The City College hereby reaffirms its endorsement of the open admissions policy and its determination to work towards fulfilling its social and academic goals."

The Evans - Novak column set off a great deal of debate in educational journals and in other more general magazines. In a lead editorial in Science, the Director of Research for the American Council on Education (headquartered in Washington, D.C.), Dr. Alexander Astin, wrote:

> "The idea that a previously selective college will be "wrecked" (as was recently alleged in one nationally syndicated column) if it moves to accept mediocre or poorly prepared applicants is simply not supported by the facts. For many years, a few of the country's major public universities have, apparently without suffering ill effects, been able to accommodate students who vary widely in ability."

The Astin editorial reminds me of a personal experience during a medical checkup several months after my arrival in New York City. When the nurse was taking my electrocardiogram, she started lecturing the new president on the evils of Open Admissions while the machine was registering my "normal" heartbeat. She told me that it was disgraceful for City College to operate under this policy and that her son, a newly enrolled freshman, would consequently receive an inferior education. I tried to reason with her gently - so as to not distort the electrocardiogram reading! - and said that if her son was as outstanding a student as she claimed, there was absolutely no reason why the excellence of a City College education for students like him, should be undermined by the College's sincere efforts to make Open Admissions work. Four years later, her son was valedictorian at the City College Commencement and his proud mother informed me - during the course of another medical checkup - that they were delighted with the quality of the City College education and that her younger son would also attend the College.

About a week after the Evans and Novak article appeared, the New York Post printed a rejoinder which stated that data gathered thus far indicated that the senior colleges of CUNY had attracted more high-ranking high school graduates and fewer low-ranking ones than most other four-year colleges in the country. 79.4% of the freshman class admitted in September 1970 to City College under Open Admissions had a B average or better, as compared to 63.4% for all four-year colleges in the country, while only 1.6% of the first Open Admissions class at the College had a high school average of C or below, compared to a national average of 7.2% for all four-year colleges. (The Post published this article four years before it was sold to a new publisher from Australia, Rupert Murdoch; when that happened, the Post's attitudes toward the College changed drastically - see below).

These figures were clear enough, but their misrepresentation or distortion by writers like Evans and Novak evidently made far better copy than the actual facts. This kind of inaccuracy, whether deliberate or accidental, characterized most of the media attacks which appeared in subsequent years. In each case, the College administration offered a detailed rebuttal, which was, more often than not, ignored, an experience common in political campaigns but hardly suitable to the serious discussion of a social and educational issue. The incessant barrage of uninformed and, in many cases, carping criticism infuriated many students and faculty, emboldened the small, but vocal group of faculty critics, confirmed the worst fears of some alumni, and, overall, created a campus community constantly on the defensive. As president, I spent much of my time at alumni chapter meetings explaining the operation of Open Admissions and trying to reassure anxious alumni that their degrees had not been irrevocably tarnished. Or, I debated Professor Adelson before the Parents Association of the Bronx High School of Science (an important feeder school for budding young scientists) in order to try to contain the damage of the "quartet of irreconcilables". On that particular occasion (in November 1971), Professor Adelson started the debate with the remark:

> "The area of difference between Dr. Marshak and myself on all aspects of higher education is 180 degrees opposite to one another, and I do not believe in any aspect at all of the present proposal that we call Open Admissions..."

and went on to urge the parents of the Bronx High School of Science students to send their children to Queens College. After all, City College was "dead", according to the then Chairman of the City College History Department, and he wanted to make sure that no efforts on my part to keep his college alive would succeed.

Parenthetically, Professor Adelson's strongly-expressed opposition to Open Admissions had repercussions in his own (History) Department (of which he had been elected Chairman by one vote, over his opponent, in the aftermath of the South Campus occupation in 1969) and created a deep schism between the departmental faction supporting him and the faction opposed. The feuding became so intense and the number of written complaints reaching my desk so great when I first arrived on campus that I decided to move ahead the outside review of the History Department by a Committee of distinguished historians (I had embarked on a policy of outside reviews of all departments at the College in order to correct faculty weaknesses and develop new strengths). The review committee for the History Department - chosen with the concurrence of Professor Adelson and his Executive Committee - consisted of three well-known historians from the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton),

Princeton University and Yale University. The committee made a series of far-reaching recommendations, as a result of which Professor Adelson resigned as chairman. (The embarrassment occasioned by his resignation evidently added a vitriolic note to Adelson's attacks on Open Admissions, the College, and the President.) The irony of this entire situation was that the well-publicized strife in the History Department led to a precipitous decline in the student registration in History courses, thereby creating a surfeit of tenured faculty in that department. At the height of the city's fiscal crisis - during the Summer of 1976 - I was faced with the decision of ruling whether to retain the services of about a dozen tenured History faculty (and assigning them other duties such as "remedial English") or of invoking the College's fiscal disability clause and retrenching them. As a staunch believer in academic tenure, I chose the former course and was later sharply criticized for misusing the talents of tenured faculty.

In any case, to continue with the Open Admissions story, in February 1973, an article by Martin Mayer entitled, "Higher Education for All?: the Case of Open Admissions" appeared in Commentary. More balanced than the usual criticism, Mayer's article was, nevertheless, riddled with what I felt were prejudices and inaccuracies. He complained, for example, that City College was giving credits for remedial courses, thereby lowering its academic standards, and quoted faculty members who felt hampered by a decrease in the proportion of "able students" they encountered during the teaching day. "I put out more, I'm more creative, when I have really good students," said City College's Professor of Chemistry, Abraham Mazur to Mr. Mayer. And Professor Mazur was not unfriendly to Open Admissions -- he had even developed an experimental chemistry course (three semesters instead of two) for Open Admissions students. It was simply that candid statements could easily be placed in contexts that created an overall negative impression. Such examples were legion. It is, of course, much more enjoyable, and far easier, for a teacher to confront students who are well-prepared and intellectually curious. What Open Admissions needed, and did not get in sufficient numbers, was more faculty members like City College's Mina Shaughnessy who had the creativity and intelligence to adapt their old methods and develop new ones, thus exchanging one form of professional gratification for another, certainly a more hard-earned one.

The same month as the Mayer article appeared in Commentary, Peter Sourian, Professor of English at Bard College, published an article in The Nation which made a point that few college professors could contest:

> "Types formed by the graduate schools aren't apt to be much good at (remedial) teaching; it wasn't at all what they'd had in mind when they chose their lifework".

The only course for such "types", Sourian continued, was to "incorporate a sense of social responsibility into their professional self-image, or they may wake up to find that they've frozen into dinosaurs overnight." Sourian quoted Seymour Hyman, then Deputy Chancellor of CUNY, as remarking that he, for one, had never conceived of a university as a place where a professor's primary function was to spend his life pouring over ancient Egyptian inscriptions. The line, according to Sourian, seemed to be drawn between those who viewed higher education as responsive to social change, and those who did not.

At this stage, new dimensions were added to the "open warfare" against Open Admissions. In 1973, Professor Heller published his book; apart from maintaining that the baleful effects of Open Admissions should be obvious to anyone, he contributed a new wrinkle to the campaign:

> "Columbia University called upon Dr. McGill, a psychologist-turned-administrator to direct its destiny. Here too the search committee wanted an appeaser rather than strong anti-militant militant, one who would act promptly and without compunction to arrest and punish lawbreakers. McGill's rhetoric stressed the need for dynamic approaches to confrontation and the importance of grasping the justifiable aspirations of dissenters. His philosophy appeared fundamentally similar to that of Marshak..."

In February 1974, another member of the "quartet", Professor Page, told the Faculty Senate that "Marshak supported Open Admissions because he wants to be known as the glamour boy of the third world".

Not to be outdone, Adelson, changing his hat from City College Professor of History to President of "United Zionist-Revisionist Inc, Herut, U.S.A." sent me a letter in May 1974 - with copies to the Mayor of New York City, all members of the BHE and many others - which began with the statement:

> "Our office has received a series of most disturbing reports from interested parties and other national Jewish organizations about the current state of affairs at The City College. Since these reports simply confirm what I personally predicted to the

Board of Higher Education and in various publications, I have placed the matter before our Board of Trustees as one that seriously affects the rights of American Jews to equitable treatment."

He then made these accusations:

> "Dean Lustig himself informed me that he did not want Jews on the advisory committee for the (Slavic Heritage) program even though they were recognized authorities in the field of Slavic Studies." (Dean Lustig denied having said this.) "...Similarly one is struck by the apparent unfairness in the dismissal of Professor X, a survivor of the Nazi death camps who rose above the horrors that defy description to a position of eminence as a historian..." (The Executive Committee of the City College Jewish Studies Department had made the decision about Professor X.)

Adelson concluded this letter with:

> "Unfortunately the list of indignities suffered by Jews as Jews at The City College under your administration could be extended even further...We shall therefore carry this fight to the very end until justice is granted."

For a year or two, as Open Admissions became more acceptable as a modus operandi at City College, and as faculty became more adjusted to the new situation (particularly since the new programs developed under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model were beginning to pull back larger numbers of well-prepared students to the College - at about that time the number of first choices for City College by entering freshmen began to exceed the number for Hunter College), the number of critical attacks seemed to abate. One exception, a kind of johnny-come-lately, was a segment of CBS' Sixty Minutes aired in April 1975. In something under 15 minutes of television time, Morley Safer presented an Evans and Novak-style picture of Open Admissions students at the College. The administration issued yet another rebuttal.

In an apparent bid to keep alive the campaign against Open Admissions, the College and the President, Professor Wagner entered (or should I say re-entered) the fray in 1976 with the publication of his book "End of Education" and followed this up by an Op. Ed. piece in The New York Times. Some quotations from his book are:

> "my student Tyrone, sitting in a half-lotus pose in back of class with a transistor strapped to his Afro, and nodding off every two minutes. is going to be a city teacher's dream by comparison with what will be occupying his seat in 1984... Our present President has been completely disloyal from the start to everything City College has stood for during a century, but his conception has to be ours, or else. Cuius regio, eius religio..."

Shortly after Professor Wagner's book and Op. Ed. piece appeared, I was invited to speak to a meeting of the City College Communications alumni. I urged the City College Communications alumni to pay more attention to the factual basis for the allegations of Wagner and other members of the "quartet of irreconcilables"; I acquired the reputation among journalists of being "thin-skinned"!

The fiscal crisis during the Summer of 1976 distracted Open Admissions critics and proponents alike with a different kind of problem: retrenchment and job security. But by February 1978 - one and one-half years after "Modified Open Admissions" was in effect - Rupert Murdoch's New York Post, a newspaper whose editorial policy seemed to have become ever more concerned with dramatic reportage, published a three-part "investigation" of Open Admissions at City College. Since Murdoch's accession, the Post had virtually created a new art form out of headlines phrased in the hyperbolic vocabulary. However, with quotes from three of the "quartet of irreconcilables" (I believe the fourth was ill), the Post was able to mount the three articles on City College with sensational headlines and mendacious content. In the first article, headlined "Illiterates in the Thousands Passing Through City College", Professor Adelson is quoted as saying:

> "Professors were told to pass students along," Adelson said. "And it was very subtly made known that if a professor expected promotion or tenure he had better do just that. "The result," Adelson added, "is that we now find ourselves in the position where illiterates are being graduated from this college."

Professor Morris Silver, Chairman of the College's Economics Department, and no warm friend of the President could not accept these allegations and is quoted in the first Post article as saying:

> "We have never dropped our standards," he said. "Our students are well prepared and well motivated and they graduate as the economists private industry wants to hire." Silver rejected the claim of widespread illiteracy in the department."

Each succeeding Post article carried a more hair-raising headline. The third article in the series carried the headline "Illiterate Students Scandal: CCNY Profs Blame Prexy". As "prexy", I was charged by Professor Adelson of:

> "using every pressure imaginable to repress the faculty. Those who agree with him are promoted and tenured, whether they are competent or not."

The article went on:

> "English professor Geoffrey Wagner, the author of the book, "The End of Education," and another open admissions foe, said "punishment for dissent has become routine." "Those who are tenured are punished by being forced to teach large numbers of remedial courses if they open their mouths. Others are pressured to retire," he said. "And we all know that Marshak is trying to push humanities courses into the background. He claims students aren't as interested as they once were. "But he had discouraged them from opting for humanities by lowering the number of credits given from four to three ..."

(The last statement was amusing because the Humanities Division had voted to increase the number of credits from 3 to 4 for the same number of class hours and the routine recommendation from the College was turned back by CUNY Central.) Professor Page's opinion cannot be omitted - he was quoted by the Post as saying:

> "Everything is done to further glorify the president," he charged, "even if it is to the detriment of the best interests of the college."

Almost accustomed by now to seeing myself depicted as an administrative ogre, I countered by asking the Post to print a retraction of what were manifest falsehoods about the College. The Post at first agreed but then converted my response into an interview embellished by new innuendo. This performance persuaded me that the only possible strategy was to run a full-page paid advertisement in the Post (on March 15, 1978) consisting of an Open Letter to the students and faculty of the College and to the people of New York. Since 1847, newspapers had been attacking the College's humanistic mission, so the Post articles were nothing new for City College. "Achieving our goals of access and excellence today," I said in the ad, "may, in many ways be more difficult than it was for past generations of students and faculty". The signed ad continued:

> 'We have accepted the obligations of remedial teaching to correct the failures of today's high schools and grade schools. We require courses in remedial writing of those who are only as good as the national average, for we do not believe that such students are fully prepared for the rigors of our curriculum...Our self-imposed high standards also inevitably mean that many of our present students will not graduate. Fully 50% of those who enter will not achieve a degree, and this is the same as the national average. Many, some of the best, will drop out or fail because of the external pressures

153

of financial need or the sort of unthinking bigotry exhibited in these Post articles that try to tell them they "don't belong" or are "too far behind...Those who do graduate obtain a diploma which deserves the respect it is accorded.

- CCNY pre-med students rank 10 percent above the national average in acceptance to medical schools.
- CCNY engineering graduates enter the professions with salaries that are well above the national average. Starting salaries for the class of 1977 averaged $16,000 per year.
- 100% of our Nursing School graduates are employed, with over 70% earning between $13,000 and $15,000 per year.
- All graduates of our Center for Biomedical Education were accepted into the third year of medical school after 4 years at CCNY. All passed Part I of the National Medical Boards, usually taken by second year medical students. (Part II is taken upon completion of medical school.)
- Nearly 70% of undergraduate majors in earth and planetary sciences have been accepted to graduate schools, including Columbia, Stanford, Princeton and the University of London.
- CCNY graduates constituted the largest percentage of architecture candidates who passed the Design and Site Planning section of New York State's 1976 national licensing exam.
- On all national college exit examinations - liberal arts and the professions - CCNY students score at or above the national norm..."

The controversy generated by the Post series of articles and the College's counter-attack persuaded The New York Times to send its education reporter, Edward Fiske, to the campus for several days to study the problem in depth. Fiske then wrote two articles for The New York Times with the first headlined "After Eight Years of Open Admissions/City College Still Debates Effect" and the second headlined "How Open Admissions Plan has Changed City College". (Note the difference in tone between the Times headlines and the Post headlines.) It was a balanced job of reportage. Fiske quoted a professor of Political Science, Dr. George McKenna:

> "Numerous professors interviewed reported a noticeable improvement in the academic quality of students over the last two years. "I'm slowly beginning to toy with reintroducing some of the more difficult materials I used to use," said George McKenna."

He quoted Dr. Ann Rees, Dean of Student Affairs:

> "The faculty is having to change its identity - from professional persons associated with an academic discipline to undergraduate teachers," said Ann Rees, "It's not easy to redefine your professional life..."

He quoted Dr. Marianne Cowen, Head of the English-as-a-Second-Language program,:

> "Dr. Cowen called her post an intellectual challenge. "In the past," she said, "I always thought I knew where students were; nowadays I have to listen to every kid. It's a positive experience - no longer being able to take young adults and treat them like sheep. It makes teaching today alive and fun..."

And finally he quoted Dr. Arthur Tiedemann, Dean of the Social Science Division (now Acting President of City College):

> "Arthur Tiedemann, also argued that with most students coming from poor backgrounds, liberal arts at City College had always had considerable relevance to the marketplace. "People remember the old days," he said, "but liberal-arts students in the 1930's had their own professional orientation. They were going into teaching, and liberal arts was the basis of the profession..."

Shortly after Fiske's articles appeared, The New York Times ran an editorial entitled "City College Lives" (perhaps a takeoff on the sensational title "How to Kill a College" invented for Dean Gross' article - his own (unused) title was "Open Admissions, a Confessional Meditation"). The Times editorial (dated June 24, 1978) is worth quoting in full:

> "The good old days of City College for many New Yorkers were when City was known as "the Harvard of the Proletariat" - when its graduates, mainly the sons of poor Jewish immigrant families, went on to earn more doctorates than the graduates of any other college in the country. But in the 131 years since its founding as the Free Academy, the college has served an ever-changing city. And in assessing its performance today, the Times's education editor, Edward Fiske, has assembled evidence that City still lives up to its traditional mission of making higher education a path out of poverty for first-generation college students.
>
> Open admissions, introduced at the beginning of this decade, seemed heresy to those who associated the college's fame with high test scores; adjusting an old mission to new circumstances has indeed severely tested the college's faculty and resources. An influx of underprepared students has required a redefinition of the teacher's function as well as the acceptance of an unprecedented

number of failures. The planners of open admissions may initially have overestimated the power of good intentions to overcome the educational deficiencies of many high school graduates.

For a while, a retreat from academic demands by some faculty members did pose a threat to standards, as it has in schools and colleges across the country. But Mr. Fiske reports that these weaknesses are being corrected and that City College is achieving a new stability with a student body that accurately reflects the city's population. New areas of accomplishment can be seen - urban medicine, law, nursing, engineering, communications.

Like the metropolis it serves, City College has passed through a painful period of adjustment. It has changed in many ways, but in its determination to raise the sights and improve the prospects of yet another generation of poor youth, City College remains the same."

The "quartet of irreconcilables" had worked so hard to tarnish the image of City College through the New York Post brand of journalism that The New York Times editorial must have infuriated them. Professor Stanley Page, sent a disgraceful letter to a publication called the "Jewish Weekly", from which I quote:

"Kindly accept my congratulations on your May 28 exposé of Jew-splitting by The New York Times...From my own bitter experience, I would illustrate this by noting the unfailing support which The Times has given to Robert E. Marshak, president of City College. Marshak's "benign neglect" of the position of Jews of City College has aided mightily in making virtually Judenrein this once great citadel of Jewish scholarship...Too many American Jews still regard the genteel ultra-liberalism of The Times (Mr. Castro, Mr. Arafat, etc.) as their political manual of arms. It is time they learned to perceive the enemy in their midst. The Times is a kind of unconscious fifth column..."

(This incredible allegation is hardly consistent with the fact that my last act as City College President was to establish a special institute in Applied Chemical Physics at City College under the Directorship of Professor Benjamin Levich, the leading Soviet Jewish dissident scientist who had been allowed to emigrate.)

I have undoubtedly devoted an inordinate amount of space to the verbal harrassment to which the College and my administration were subjected by the "quartet of irreconcilables". It is true that

156

they were extreme examples of a small number of City College faculty who were nostalgic about the heady years for liberal arts immediately after World War II, seemingly intransigent to change, insensitive to the needs of a radically shifting student population and intent upon obstructing the successful implementation of Open Admissions. Unfortunately, the ready access of this vocal minority to the mass media of New York City for the promotion of their persistent negativism required the College to maintain a constant alert.

§4. The Gross Incident

For me the least expected and most dramatic attack on the college was launched by Professor Theodore Gross, Dean of Humanities at the College and former Vice-President of Institutional Advancement -- and one-time outspoken defender of the Open Admissions policy. The Gross article, part of a book-in-progress, appeared in The Saturday Review of February 4, 1978. The magazine gave the article the title, "How to Kill a College: the Private Papers of a Campus Dean." This article made a great number of surprising statements, considering its authorship, several of which were noted in §2 of this Chapter. Here, I shall briefly attempt to set the record straight (at least from my vantage point) because Professor Gross has since published a book based on this Saturday Review article with the much restrained title, Academic Turmoil: The Reality and Promise of Open Education. Approximately one-third of the book was given over to his relationship with me as president of City College (although he never mentioned my name). I shall refer to former Dean Gross by name, and believe that I can place the Gross incident in proper perspective within the compass of much less than one-third of these memoirs by simply reporting the salient facts that were omitted in Professor Gross' much more detailed account.

The first inkling that I had of the forthcoming publication of an article by Dean Gross in The Saturday Review was a telephone call one afternoon in late January of 1978 in which Gross informed me that the proofs of an article he had written had arrived with a title that was repugnant to him. He sounded disturbed. Inasmuch as I had never seen the article, I did not have the vaguest notion of its contents, and so all I could do was to offer moral support and say something to the effect that "I was sure that he could persuade The Saturday Review editor to change the title". What did strike me as strange at the time was that the telephone call followed within an hour a private meeting between the two of us - arranged at my request - in which I had urged him not to lose heart in the recruitment of an outstanding person for a highly important position in the Humanities Division.

It was an undeniable fact that the imposition of tuition and the massive retrenchment of young untenured faculty (the English Department was particularly hard hit) had been a terrible blow to City College (and to other units of CUNY). But the whole point of the Development Campaign - into which I was then pouring so much of my personal energy - was to help overcome the adverse circumstances and to move the institution into a position of recovery and renewal. To accomplish these objectives required maximum efforts from all members of Central Administration as well as faculty. During this critical period, Dean Gross wrote, submitted and saw published the Saturday Review article, an article whose opening paragraph was:

> "My office is in Lincoln Corridor, on the ground floor of an old gothic building called Shephard Hall, at the City College of New York, 138th Street and Convent Avenue, Harlem. Outside this office, on makeshift benches, students congregate -- Black, Puerto Rican, Asian, and varieties of ethnic White -- playing radios, simulating sex, languidly moving back and forth to classes,

158

dancing and singing, eating and studying and sleeping and drinking from soda cans or from beer bottles wrapped in brown paper bags..."

This opening salvo in the Saturday Review article by Dean Gross was followed by a long series of intemperate statements of which I give a small sampling:

> "...Politics dictated educational policy...White educators were now being asked by minorities to say no in thunder to a form of education that had been exclusive, intellectually elitist, unresponsive to colored Americans, and unyielding in its demand for only - only - academic excellence..."

Again:

> "Anyone who had ever passed through the City College knew that the physical conditions there were as bad as almost anywhere else in urban America. But once the student had entered the classroom, the peeling walls and encrusted windowpanes vanished - the electricity of mind compensated for everything. I remember having taught "Tintern Abbey" to the belching music of a city bus, and it worked. Now everything seemed plebeian - particularly the minds of the students..."

Again:

> "Minorities, including now impatient women, used affirmative action to leap into positions of power or to retain their jobs..."

Again:

> "Clouding the issues of literacy and of open admissions, and every consequent question of how to give a liberal arts education in an urban setting, was the sudden primacy of ethnicity and race. It conditioned everyone's response because it was central to the purpose of open admissions..."

Again:

> "The creation of ethnic studies departments at the City College and throughout the nation represented an educational capitulation to extreme political pressure by minority groups. Once black studies was established, Puerto Rican, Asian, and Jewish studies had to follow; and before long, courses in ethnic history and sociology and literature were conflicting with those of the traditional departments...As each career program was established, the traditional disciplines in liberal arts and sciences were placed in a service relationship to vocationalism - as though the only way the disciplines could be made interesting or relevant was by attaching them to practical programs..."

(I note in passing that when Professor Gross published his book, many of the above passages in the Saturday Review article were substantially modified, e.g. the key sentence in the opening paragraph became:

> "...outside this office, on makeshift benches, students used to congregate - Black, Puerto Rican, Asian, and varieties of ethnic white - studying texts, preparing papers, playing the radio, moving back and forth to classes, lingering in a space that had come to serve as a temporary lounge - a passageway that led from the campus to the classrooms to a terrace looking eastward over Harlem..."

The last two sentences of the second passage became:

> "...I remember having taught "Tintern Abbey" to the belching background music of a city bus, and it had worked. Now the students seemed so poorly prepared, one wondered how that poetry could survive in the classroom. Was all our time to be spent in shaping passable prose?..."

(I think that if Gross had been as temperate in his Saturday Review article as he later was in his book, there would have been no Gross incident!)

The Saturday Review article by Dean Gross - with its inflammatory title and revolting graphics - hit the campus like a bombshell and caused me great personal distress. As I indicated earlier, I was aware of some of his disappointments but I was hoping that Dean Gross could persevere through the academic year 1977-78, contribute his share of leadership and administrative creativity to the College, and then take a sabbatic year to write his book on "Liberal Arts and Urban Education". I was not prepared for the unseemly and destructive fashion in which he chose to express his frustration and disillusionment.

Soon after The Saturday Review article, Dean Gross claimed that his original article had dealt in a balanced way with the complexities of City College problems but that the editors had cut the piece drastically, and had published a completely negative and sensational account of Open Admissions. I reminded Dean Gross that authors have complete control of the final contents of their published articles and that he must accept responsibility for the condescending, insulting and terribly lopsided article about Open Admissions that had actually been published. Rather strongly, I informed him in an Open Letter:

> "...I question the tone, style and insensitivity of your article. Your use of code words and stereotyping language about women and minorities constitutes a dangerous appeal to the forces of unreason and bigotry in our society. I am profoundly troubled that your anger is so intense and your frustrations so great that you knowingly publish an article that is so destructive of the atmosphere of harmony and tolerance on the campus which the administration, of which you are a part, has attempted so assiduously to establish..."

Further, I pointed out in the Open Letter that some of Dean Gross' specific points were difficult to refute because they were based on incomplete information or were contradictory. For example, Dean Gross stated that the "Asians were remarkable students of engineering and mathematics" but they "needed a vast amount of attention in... the writing of English." While he seemed to cite this as an argument against Open Admissions, it was really an argument for it. Or, at another point in his article, he lamented that "we were preparing our students to be the parents of college students, not to be students themselves." Is this unenlightened social policy? (It is likely that many of the children and granchildren of the non-graduates of the Class of 1911 were some of the distinguished graduates of City College in the Thirties and later years.) Finally, it was apparent that the average reader of Dean Gross' article would be persuaded of a casual relationship leading from Open Admissions to the ethnic studies departments, to an unstructured "cafeteria curriculum", to a decline of interest in the humanities and, a fortiori, to a decline in college standards.

The Saturday Review article by Dean Gross published in January 1978 belied all his own former writings and actions as well. As a highly responsible member of Central Administration, why did Dean Gross permit this to happen? I shall allow Dean Gross to speak for himself. I quote from a personal letter which he wrote to me soon after the publication of The Saturday Review article:

> "For eight years, I have served the City College in one administrative capacity or another -- as an elected chairman, as an appointed Associate Dean and Dean, and as an appointed Acting Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement. These have been difficult years for all of us in higher education. As you know, I have shared your vision of an urban educational model. The range of new programs, developed under your leadership and largely through your energies -- the Center for Biomedical Education, the Center for Urban Legal Studies, and the Leonard Davis Center for the Performing Arts, to cite only the most obvious -- have been truly extraordinary. Most college presidents would have surrendered to the incredible pressures that were brought upon you, internally and externally, and sacrificed the previous tradition of City College to the shifting and competing angles of vision that often were myopic. In an age of bureaucracy, you have not been a bureaucratic president. To have developed the concept of an urban educational model in the midst of economic, social, and political controversies took a great deal of courage and vision -- and you know, and the City College community knows, that I have not only supported you in implementing this vision but championed it. Quite concretely, this urban educational model is the most ambitious attempt on the part of a college president to grapple with urban problems that I know of -- and whatever else happens, you will be known and be remembered for its brilliance...But at the same time, and in the same College, I have personally never felt that the urban educational model -- as imaginative as it is in concept and in its particulars -- has ever been connected organically with a liberal arts education. Obviously, this is no one person's fault -- not at a time when young people (for very good economic reasons) are so driven to an education that is connected with careers. Obviously, if a faculty does not require students to take certain courses, then the laissez-faire curriculum will create the atomization that I deplore in my article. I think I know the difficulty of establishing a liberal arts education at this or any large urban college; I lived through the endless meetings that went into the development of our current 'core' curriculum. The confusion of purpose in a college of so many departments and of so many special interest groups would have been true whether we had an urban educational model or not..."

It was precisely because Dean Gross was a prime actor in the early formulation of the Urban Educational Model that I considered his willingness to publish the sensationalized article as a failure of nerve. It was precisely because I had endeavored to support Dean Gross' efforts to restore the humanities at the center of the City College experience that I decided that his acquiescence in the publication of the Saturday Review article was not so much an act of defiance but rather an admission of complete loss of faith in the future of City College. The privilege of publicly expressing such a loss of faith is guaranteed to professors but not to members of a Central Administration. This is the reason why I sought and accepted Professor Gross' resignation as Dean and gave him leave of absence to complete the book of which the Saturday Review article was supposedly the first installment.

As far as I am concerned, the rest of the Gross incident can be summarized rather quickly (although, as mentioned before, Professor Gross chose to devote one-third of his book to a dramatic rendition of the sequence or events leading to his resignation). Once I had reached the conclusion that the College could no longer continue in service a Dean whose public behavior had been so harmful to its interests, the question became one of timing and compassion. The student confrontational meetings with Dean Gross - the students were particularly upset because he was Dean - were carefully monitored by the administration (the fact is that there was no violence and no police were ever called) and I waited patiently for Dean Gross to exercise his usual good judgment and submit his resignation as a prelude to his long-delayed sabbatic leave. I also waited for the students' anger to subside so that the announcement of Dean Gross' resignation would not create new problems. After about two months, with no sign that Dean Gross was willing to face up to the consequences of his own disaffection, I called him in for a meeting that I thought would end in his voluntary and almost relieved resignation. Since we had worked together for so many years, I tried to explain to him why he could no longer continue as a member of Central Administration and why the leave of absence would be helpful to everyone concerned (including himself). When his formal letter of resignation, together with the requested leave of absence, arrived, I thought that this strategy - though painful - had worked and my view seemed to be reinforced when Dean Gross was quoted in The New York Times shortly thereafter as stating that his resignation followed "a mutual recognition on the part of the president and me that it would be wise for me to resign". Regrettably, Dean Gross' resignation was followed by charges - in which, to my chagrin, Dean Gross joined - that I was abridging academic freedom and stifling intellectual dissent on the City College campus. After being criticized throughout my presidency by some groups in the City College community and outside that I had too vigorously supported the rights of faculty and students to freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom of assembly, I was somewhat taken aback and issued a statement on the Gross resignation, from which I quote:

> "...The current charge of violation freedom is without merit...in an explication of the 1940 Statement of Principles concerning Academic Freedom, the American Association of University Professors states that 'as a member of his community, the professor has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his responsibilities to his subject, to his

students, to his profession, and to his institution. When he speaks or acts as a private person he avoids creating the impression that he speaks or acts for his college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.' Note that the underlined sentence clearly states how faculty must use restraint in the exercise of their academic freedom. The corollary for administrative officers of colleges or universities is that they are not protected by the principles of academic freedom when they speak or act on behalf of their institutions. They protect themselves and their institutions by carefully distinguishing between their personal views and their institutional roles...The principle is really very simple and well established in academe: a college or university administrator has an obligation to urge his views as policies are being shaped but once policies are articulated, it is the responsibility of an administrator to implement these policies. If he cannot support institutional policies, then he should resign his administrative post and continue to champion his dissenting views as a valued member of the faculty..."

My position was supported by the Executive Committee of the City College Faculty Senate which passed a resolution, stating that:

"The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has met with the President and with the Dean of Humanities to discuss the situation created by the non-reappointment of the Dean and its perception by the College community. The Committee feels satisfied that there has been no violation of Academic Freedom. Without evaluating the merits of the President's action, we feel that it was made on the grounds of Administrative Responsibility and as such, clearly, a matter of Presidential judgement."

The New York Civil Liberties Union and the American Association of University Professors considered the Gross case and declared it not to be a violation of academic freedom.

Notwithstanding the supportive views (of the President) of those groups closest to the situation, a veritable stream of abusive mail poured in from some of the alumni. From the president of a small business:

"...I intend to fight to have you removed - and Dean Gross reinstated. We need more like him and less like you - if we are to survive. I pray that I will live long enough to see the pendulum swing back to center position from the extremes that the asshole mentality such as yours has pushed it..."

From a professor in an English Department in a state university:

"...I have just heard of the forced resignation of Dean Theodore Gross, and as an alumnus and an academic, I wish to express my profound dismay. Your action goes against all that the magnificent traditions of City College have stood for, and for which I hope it will somehow eventually stand once again...whether justly or not, your action will cause more people to assume that Open Admissions is a dismal--and dishonest--failure than all the essays the Saturday Review could ever publish..."

From a physician:

"...With apologies to Alan Payton 'Cry My Beloved College'. 'I remember, I remember' the college where I was taught. 'I remember, I remember' when students were admitted on the basis of scholastic achievement REGARDLESS of race, creed, color or ethnic national origin. I remember stimulating courses; I remember brilliant students stimulating a gifted faculty. I remember the struggle for admission to professional colleges. I remember Townsend Harris High School for gifted student -- since abolished as it doesn't fit in with the plans of education(?) in New York... Public schools are armed camps, high school graduates cannot read or write, many college students of today couldn't gain entrance to Townsend Harris, and degrees mean nothing...That is exactly what you are doing -- perpetrating a hoax of a college education, and a college degree both on society and on the recipient whose frustation will know no bounds when he cannot compete with the real thing... Competence and superiority in academic skills should be your goals, not to drag City College Students down to the lowest common denominator. 'Cry My Beloved College'..."

From a minority alumnus:

"...I am just a layman and as a young man, as a member of a minority group, struggled my way through what I came to consider one of the best schools in the world. You know, as well as I do, the accomplishments of thousands upon thousands of such motivated struggling graduates...This is a direct result of competition and excellence in education...The open admissions program defeated this purpose and I am positive in my mind and heart that we will never again graduate students of the same caliber as before the program. You and your administration are fostering policies which will breed incompetency and mediocrity rather than excellence and accomplishment. I am honestly disappointed and disillusioned..."

And finally from an unidentified alumnus (except for the class):

"For you to condone his removal, let alone be a force in removing him is appalling. I see your action as either (1) support of a perverted justice, or a mindless discrimination against whites in the name of so-called fair play, whose illogic is mind-boggling; or (2) a spineless, yellow-livered cave-in to the mob, to prejudice, to benightedness..."

I shall let John Farago, who reviewed Gross' book in the "Chronicle of Higher Education" (February 25, 1980) reply for me:

"..And so when, with all humility and a considerable amount of respect, I analyze the problem Dean Gross faced, I think he was wrong up and down the line...If, as dean, he wanted to make charges from within, then he should have relied on internal mechanisms. He should have used his influence with the president of City College, with his colleagues, and with his students. He should have fought his bottle in the college's own media rather than in the public press. If he simply wanted to address the issues of open admissions in a studied and scholarly fashion, he should not have been so naive as to believe that he could keep his philosophy (expressed in the pages of a national magazine) totally separate from the politics of his college. In a way, he seems to have understood this quite clearly. He notes that, if he had shown his draft to this president, as was requested, 'it would have become an institutional document or it would not have been published at all.'...His other choice was the strategy of the 60's: to publish openly and in defiance. In practice, that was the option Gross chose. It was a political choice, although he did not view it as such, a blatantly adversarial power gamble wholly unrelated to any question of freedom of expression..."

I am amazed by Mr. Farago's sensitivity to what actually transpired, at least from my point of view. It was almost as if Mr. Farago were advising me on the proper course of action after the Saturday Review article appeared. Mr. Farago was not familiar with the growing evidence of Dean Gross' alienation from the College and perhaps he would permit me to replace his word "defiance" by my phrase "failure of nerve". I still hope that some day Ted Gross will regain his faith - in redemption, in compassion, and in humanism.

Chapter 4

Liberal Arts in an Urban Environment

§1 City College's Tradition of General Education and Career Training

The impulse which gave rise to our efforts over the past decade to establish alternatives to the traditional liberal arts programs at City College is rooted in the tradition of Western culture. From classical times to the present, those concerned with the education of youth have been concerned with the focus of the educational venture. Educators in the monastic schools of the Middle Ages pondered whether young men ought to be prepared for a life of contemplation or a life of action, that is to say, a life devoted to concerns that were primarily internal, intellectual, spiritual, as opposed to a life devoted to engaging in the external business of society. During the Renaissance, under the influence of such powerful educators as the Jesuits, it became increasingly common to call for a method of education that would prepare young people for a life in the world that was motivated by spiritual and intellectual ideas, i.e. a life of action infused by contemplation. By the time of the Enlightenment, the dichotomy between the contemplative and active life styles had become thoroughly secularized. Education might prepare a student for a life devoted to scholarly pursuits or for a life devoted to a career in society. And by the middle of the nineteenth century, when City College was founded, students could make their own decisions as to how far along the broad spectrum between pure scholarship and practical endeavor, they would choose their careers.

From its very inception (see Preface and Chapter 1), City College combined the requirements of a general education with the practical needs of career training. As a consequence, the College developed a national reputation for providing its economically and socially disadvantaged students with the liberal arts education and pre-professional training they needed to climb the ladder of social mobility to personal satisfaction and achievement. Their success was the city's and the country's as graduates poured into business, education, politics, the professions and all areas of public and cultural life. The list of alumni who traveled from the impoverished ghettoes of New York to City College and on to notable post-graduate careers is a long and distinguished one. This basic educational philosophy - that of training its students for meaningful careers by means of a well-integrated liberal arts curriculum - prevailed at the College through most of its first one hundred years.

The balance between liberal arts education and professional or pre-professional training was maintained until World War II not only at City College but quite generally in American public colleges and universities. In the aftermath of World War II, American higher education (both private as well as public) entered a period of rapid growth. The student population doubled every decade and the need for new faculty in the liberal arts grew even more rapidly than in the professional fields. The requirement of a doctoral degree for employment as a college or university teacher led to the rapid expansion of doctoral work and the widespread propagation of the concept that any

American university (or even college) of top rank should be a community of scholars with research productivity the primary measure of academic excellence. When the Ph.D. became the credentialing mechanism for college and university faculty in the United States (including community colleges), scholars were fed into the higher educational system as undergraduate teachers and it was only natural for these faculty to try to steer the education of their youthful charges in the direction they themselves had taken. The resulting tilt in the American higher educational enterprise towards the "pure" and the "general" - in contrast to the "applied" and the "practical" - could easily be accommodated as long as career opportunities existed for further replications of scholars after the Ph.D.

Unfortunately, during those halcyon years (i.e. the two decades after World War II), not sufficient attention was paid to the projected peaking (and even contraction) in college and university student enrollment and the inevitable saturation of the academic marketplace in liberal arts. In addition, student unrest in the late sixties and early seventies that flowed from the Viet Nam War and the Civil Rights movement, had a negative impact on undergraduate perception of the traditional liberal arts courses. During the first five years of the 1970's, the percentage of undergraduate majors in the liberal arts throughout the United States dropped by approximately a factor of two, the percentages in the arts (fine and performing) and sciences remained roughly stationary, while the percentage of majors in the professions increased by more than 50%. This well-known fact was reflected in the following statement contained in the 1976 Report on City College by the Evaluation Team of the Middle States Association:

> "...All (members of the Evaluation Team) were struck with the degree to which many of the problems facing City College are shared by almost any institution of higher education one can name. The reduction in requirements in the traditional liberal arts; the increased demand for career education; the popularity among students of affective, as opposed to cognitive, styles; the decline in interest in the past resulting in turning away from history, classics, and much of literature, are all problems at the home campuses of team members. A recognition of their universality may somewhat reduce the sense of desperation about them..."

Ironically, City College (and the other units of City University), precisely because of Open Admissions, had a surge of student enrollment at the beginning of the Seventies and augmented its liberal arts faculty at a time when other colleges were shrinking. The Dean of Humanities at City (who had been Chairman of the English Department) complained with fervor in his Saturday Review article that he was compelled to hire aspiring "Spenserian scholars" (i.e. graduate students working for their Ph.D.'s in traditional fields of English and American literature) to teach remedial English to the new cohort of Open Admissions students. The indubitable fact is that there would have been no opportunity to hire future humanities scholars (Spenserian or otherwise) to teach anything in most of the colleges that had moved into the "no-growth" pattern.

Another truism is that students who come from lower and lower-middle income backgrounds, as did the majority of both Open Admissions and non-Open Admissions students at City College, are and have always been concerned with pursuing a liberal arts curriculum that will provide them with economically viable career options. To paraphrase John Adams - I must study politics and war so that my sons can study poetry, art, Greek, and procelain design. Faculty members immersed in their own field of specialization, must acknowledge without condescension the value of professional or pre-professional training. Ideally, the faculty ought to revise their course offerings so that students can embark on chosen careers without losing the broad cultural tradition in which they will lead their lives. Because of my concern for this critical educational balance, I encouraged the development of serious alternatives to the traditional liberal arts programs soon after I assumed the City College presidency. My intent was not to supplant nor subvert the liberal arts but to enlarge their scope, to explore their interconnections with pre-professional clusters of courses, and to use the liberal arts as the core of educationally sound inter-disciplinary programs of great interest to the new (and old) undergraduates. I also hoped that success in these undertakings would help City College reverse what was a national trend of declining enrollment in the liberal arts disciplines.

Parenthetically, some liberal arts faculty could not reconcile my support for judicious modification of the traditional liberal arts curriculum with my constant reaffirmation of a deeply held view that liberal arts were at the heart of the City College experience. I could not persuade these skeptics even when I cited the fact that I had been an undergraduate major in philosophy at Columbia College, had been a modern dance critic for the Columbia Spectator, and had spent the upper division years taking that marvelous Columbia course on "Colloquium on Great Books of the Western Tradition", team-taught by Jacques Barzun and Lionel Trilling. I did not even gain "brownie points" when I embellished the story of my past with the true statement that John Berryman and I had been Associate Editors of the Columbia Literary Magazine at the same time and that I had been responsible for publishing Paul Goodman's first story!

Many liberal arts faculty were aware of the College's obligation to be responsive to the diverse needs of its new multi-ethnic student body and to the realities of urban America during the decade of the Seventies and for the foreseeable future. A number of concerned faculty expressed a willingness to devote their energies to develop alternatives to the traditional liberal arts programs, alternatives that would stay in touch with changing tastes and needs of the City College student body. These faculty efforts crystalized in a variety of curricula offerings that moved in urban, problem-focused, contemporary-centered or performance-oriented directions. In §2, under the title "Experiments in Non-Traditional Liberal Arts Education", I cover the Pilot Program in Humanistic Studies (PPHS) started in 1971 and discontinued in 1976, a victim to the fiscal crisis of New York City. The Social History program is a further example of experiments in non-traditional liberal arts education. The very successful Creative Writing and Performing Arts programs are also treated in §2. Strictly speaking, the Ethnic Studies Departments constitute an experiment in non-traditional liberal arts education but these departments are only part of the overall role played by ethnicity at City College and are therefore considered in a separate chapter (Chapter 5) on "Ethnicity, Ethnic Studies and the Third World".

In §3, under the title "New Directions in Liberal Arts Education", I treat the more recent faculty efforts to offer alternatives to the traditional liberal arts program. I first consider the creation of an interdisciplinary core curriculum option in the College of Liberal Arts and Science, in contradistinction to the more traditional disciplinary core curriculum option. I next discuss an attempt to design a series of programs under the rubric of "Humanities, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy", that would build various clusters of pre-rpofessional studies on a humanities base and with a public policy emphasis. An example treated in some detail is the "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy" program that has received wide student acceptance. The programs in "Humanities, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy" (the so-called PITH programs - PITH standing for Program in the Humanities) were initiated with a planning grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. When the NEH Planning Grant was used up, the equivalent of the PITH programs received funding in the Fall of 1978 from the Mellon Foundation (at a level of approximately one-half million dollars for a three-year period). Actually, the Mellon Grant was intended to support a somewhat expanded version of the PITH programs under the title "Liberal Arts, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy" (LAPP programs). The change from the term "humanities" to "liberal arts" in the title is intended to underline the equal status of the social sciences and the humanities in the development of serious alternatives to the traditional liberal arts offerings through the LAPP programs.

§2 Experiments in Non-Traditional Liberal Arts Education

The first attempt to create an alternative to the traditional liberal arts curriculum came about as the result of a 1969 memorandum by an Advisory Committee on Alternate Studies under the chairmanship of an English professor, Arthur Waldhorn. The Waldhorn Committee, reacting to the complaints by a group of students of inflexibility and irrelevance in the traditional curriculum, recommended an alternate studies program which would appeal to students who had been drifting away from the traditional courses of study. The Waldhorn memorandum was in tune with the temper of the late Sixties when the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education found that 90% of 70,000 undergraduates polled felt that the College curriculum should be made "more relevant to contemporary life and problems" and educational leaders like Ewald B. Nyquist, New York State Commissioner of Education, stated publicly that he wanted to "make the educational system more humanistic - humane with respect to the curriculum, administration, governance, and, indeed, the whole teaching and learning process." The Waldhorn memorandum made it clear that its recommendations would not satisfy students "who are determined at any cost to remain alienated from authority, society, culture, or learning." It did claim that an alternate studies programs could set "a pattern of education sufficiently flexible to encourage the exploration of issues or areas with a sense of autonomy and self-determined participation." As the Waldhorn memorandum put it,

> "we are involved in an unresolved debate between liberal education-- a classically structured, prescriptive curriculum leading to a specialization--and general education-- a non-prescriptive, individual-centered curriculum, more directly reflective of crucial issues of the time."

The Waldhorn memorandum was filed away, without action, in the aftermath of the South Campus occupation and the resignation of my predecessor, Buell Gallagher.

After my arrival, the Waldhorn memorandum was brought to my attention by the then chairman of the Faculty Senate at City College, Professor Arthur Bierman (Physics), and I was persuaded that an Ad Hoc Faculty Senate - Faculty Council (of the College of Liberal Arts and Science) Committee should examine the desirability of initiating a Pilot Program in Humanistic Studies (PPHS). I must confess that the basis of my willingness to look into this possibility on an experimental basis was a very satisfying educational experience that I had undergone at the University of Rochester several years earlier. As a result of freshman discontent at Rochester that, except for the large lecture classes, instruction during the freshmen year was primarily conducted by graduate students, a system of freshman "preceptorials" was set up "to introduce small groups (not to exceed twenty) of selected freshmen to areas of intellectual inquiry". I had team-taught such a freshman preceptorial on "Science and World Affairs" with a history professor and, while we had conducted the preceptorial in the informal and participatory spirit of the Waldhorn memorandum, the design of the preceptorial was structured, the reading list well-defined, and the intellectual demands sufficiently high, that both students and teachers were very happy with the experience. Consequently, I was receptive to the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee to initiate PPHS and when Professor Bierman himself offered to serve as its Acting Director, I gave him the charge to supervise the design of an interdisciplinary curriculum built around problems of contemporary significance. In my letter of appointment to Professor Bierman, I also set the first year of the program's life as a preliminary planning period which would be "preparatory to the establishment of a School of Humanistic Studies the following year" if the experiment succeeded.

PPHS, therefore, was originally envisaged as a kind of experimental college within the College. The exact nature, structure, and methods of this experimental college were left rather vague so that the design and rationale of the program could be worked out by those engaged in the experiment. The hope was that this alternative educational program would attract back to City College those students with good academic qualifications who were choosing to go elsewhere, increase enrollment in the College of Liberal Arts and Science and, at the same time, help motivate the many disaffected but capable students already at the College. The alternative education developed through PPHS was to be more flexible and humane in order to meet the needs of those students who said they were disenchanted with the traditional curriculum and who felt increasingly disenfranchised by the ethnic base of campus politics. PPHS was not very attractive to minority students, who preferred to take advantage of their opportunity for a college education to enroll in the more traditional liberal arts curriculum or in the professional schools.

Professor Bierman assembled a small full-time staff and with the addition of a number of faculty members from existing college departments who agreed to devote part-time to the program, PPHS started operating in the Fall of 1971 after a good deal of publicity on the campus. Professor Waldhorn quite appropriately chaired the Advisory Committee that was set up to monitor the performance of PPHS. A total of six double seminars of eight credits each were offered to an initial student enrollment of 120. The courses included: "American Individualism"; "How to be a Survivor"; "Politics and Culture"; "The City"; "Mind and the Varieties of Inner Experience." PPHS thus began with a set of courses, reading lists, dedicated teachers, some promise of innovative learning experiences and a group of expectant and, perhaps, somewhat cynical students. For eight credits students were expected to complete a major independent study project in addition to the seminar work itself. An emphasis on student participation and a concentration on contemporary problems and themes approached in interdisciplinary fashion, were the prime characteristics of the curriculum. Durings its first year, PPHS succeeded in generating much interest, excitement, and positive student involvement. Nearly every student managed to produce a project, some truly excellent. At a "post-mortem" faculty meeting held in January, 1972, the PPHS staff concluded that the program was doing well in generating student enthusiasm and commitment, and that all involved were learning a great deal.

As it entered its second year, PPHS began to show signs of tension and uncertainty replacing the overriding sense of direction that had marked its beginning. The Program originally had one year to create its curriculum, teach it, plan for an experimental college, and undergo evaluation by its Advisory Committee. This committee evaluation, chaired by Professor Waldhorn, presented a mixed report which gave the program staff good marks for effort but criticized the insufficient educational leadership and initiative in the classroom on the part of the faculty, and the inadequate emphasis on a coherent intellectual content for the material covered. The Acting Director, Professor Bierman, agreed with the basic thrust of the Waldhorn Committee's criticisms and tried to persuade his staff to acknowledge their constructive character and to make changes in the design of PPHS that would meet these criticisms. Despite many internal meetings between the Acting Director and his staff, the staff rejected the Waldhorn Committee's comments as invalid and undeserving of serious consideration. As a result, Professor Bierman resigned as Acting Director of PPHS at the end of the Spring semester, 1973 and explained the reasons for his resignation in his Annual Report on the program. Among other things, he said, that in his opinion:

> "...By the spring semester of 1973 there had been established within PPHS a group of courses which were heavily oriented toward an amateur kind of psychotherapy or consciousness-raising, which lacked any discernible intellectual content and which seemed increasingly to attract students with a predominant interest in the generation of eight easy credits with an almost automatic A or B..."

Professor Bierman went on to say that the PPHS courses were developing a bad reputation among students outside the program and driving away the more serious ones. He concluded with the observation:

> "...I do believe that the college deserves an innovative program; I also believe that such a program should have an intellectual content, that its grades should bear some reasonable relation to normal standards and that it should result in discernible learning..."

With Bierman's resignation, PPHS was in serious confusion and disarray at the end of two years but finally prevailed on the Faculty Senate to give it another one-year extension. A very reputable English Professor, Leo Hamalian, agreed to become the Acting Director of PPHS during its third experimental year. PPHS's third year witnessed a marked change in atmosphere. A renewed sense of enthusiasm replaced the demoralizing tension and uncertainty of the preceding year. The more the staff examined and debated basic questions of goals and possibilities, the more obvious it seemed that fundamental changes in the design of PPHS were called for. The staff prepared a memorandum which was presented to the Faculty Senate when the program sought an extension of its authorization to exist after the end of the third year. A key element in this memo was the candid admission that the original goals set for PPHS were impossible to achieve. The staff argued that it was unrealistic for PPHS to try to attract students back to City College, as well as to try to redirect those who had become alienated. On the other hand, they agreed that it would be useful to maintain PPHS as an ongoing educational laboratory for the College. Rather than trying to create an alternative college within the College, the PPHS staff called for a redefinition of PPHS as a "Laboratory for Innovation" which would continue to address the needs of the College in the broad area of innovative education. PPHS would continue to provide a setting where faculty from existing traditional departments could experiment with new ideas and topics, while it would allow for and encourage many points of view and approaches. Each course would stand or fall on its own as an innovative educational venture. Against the opposition of the Faculty Senate, PPHS struggled to obtain permission to continue in its redefined role during the 1974-75 academic year.

At this stage, Professor Hamalian and two members of his staff came to see me, seeking my personal support for the continuation of PPHS. I must admit that I had become increasingly concerned about the future of PPHS because the two initial and highly regarded faculty protagonists for this program, had disengaged themselves from it. But preoccupation with other pressing college matters and the contradictory advice that I was receiving from my chief advisors concerning the direction that PPHS was taking, had persuaded me to maintain a "hands-off" policy. Nevertheless, Professor Hamalian's appeal possessed merit and I suggested that he enjoin the Faculty Senate to authorize another year's extension of the program with the provisio that it be reviewed by a panel of outside consultants.

This strategy worked and during the Summer of 1974, the Faculty Senate assembled an outside evaluation committee to report on PPHS. The committee consisted of a three-person team made up of Dr. Herbert Blau of the University of Maryland; Dr. George Fischer of the CUNY Graduate Center; and Dr. John J. Neumaier of SUNY's Metropolitan New York Learning Center. The Visiting Committee submitted its report in November, 1974. It found that while in comparison with the activities of other American colleges and universities, PPHS was neither innovative nor experimental, it offered something quite distinctive to City College in bringing "a mode of learning and teaching that had become widespread nationally but had not yet taken root there." While the committee remarked that PPHS had been burdened by having to struggle for its very existence year after year, it also found that PPHS's evident lack of structure was conducive to an optimal educational experience. PPHS was seen to have the advantage of an energetic and youthful faculty who could help:

> "...some students overcome their alienation and comparative intellectual naivete and isolation sufficiently to take seriously academic studies which call for competence in the analysis of ideas, for greater sensitivity to logical questions and sociological presuppositions, as well as for aesthetic development..."

Hence, while PPHS suffered from an inability to live up to its initial aims to build a single unitary alternative to the existing liberal arts curriculum, the Visiting Committee recommended that City College should give PPHS permanent status. This recommendation carried with it the proviso that PPHS receive a more concrete and better articulated educational mandate than had been the case up to that point, and a structure which would ensure quality control of all its activities in terms of that mandate.

The recommendations of the Visiting Committee came too late to save PPHS, at least in the form and with the budgetary support that had been allocated throughout its turbulent career. As the Faculty Senate wrestled with the Visiting Committee's recommendations during the Spring of 1975, the fiscal crisis of New York City steadily worsened and by the Fall of 1975, New York City insisted on a retrenchment plan from most of its agencies, including CUNY. As City College attempted to order its academic priorities during the academic year 1975-76 (among other casualties, all construction - of Aaron Davis Hall and the North Academic Center - had ceased as of November 1975), PPHS became a prime target for retrenchment. It was not so much that PPHS was making a large claim on the tax-levy budget of the College, but rather that the rectification of its deficiencies - in accordance with the Visiting Committee's recommendations and in my own judgment - would require an additional outlay of tax-levy funds which simply could not be made available for the subsequent year. PPHS was therefore terminated as of September 1, 1976 - as were other departments and programs of low priority at the College.

Perhaps if PPHS had not moved away from its broad-based thematic direction into a rather narrow and overly-rhetorical treatment of a relatively limited collection of topics, it might have been in a sufficiently strong position to escape retrenchment during the Summer of 1976. However that may be, PPHS was not the only "arrow in the College's bow" with regard to the development of alternatives to the traditional liberal arts curriculum. Many departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Science began to actively examine their curricula at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and to introduce modifications that would pay heed to the educational needs of the new multi-ethnic student body at City College and the urgent problems of New York City. Many of the curricular changes were self-generated and others were encouraged by the system of Visiting Committees of Distinguished Scholars which I launched during the first year of my presidency.

The first Visiting Committees for the College of Liberal Arts and Science departments were organized in the Spring of 1971 and, for a variety of reasons, were started in the Social Science Division. I have previously mentioned the History Visiting Committee headed by Professor Carl Schorske of Princeton. The Economics team was headed by Professor Kenneth Arrow, then at Harvard (before he became a Nobel

Laureate); Sociology by Professor Martin Lipset, then also at Harvard; and Anthropology by Professor Robert Adams, then Dean of the Social Sciences Division at Chicago. These Visiting Committees and others that came to the City College campus lent a helpful hand with major departmental curricula changes on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It should be noted that the actual process of academic innovation and the modification of the traditional liberal arts curriculum received impetus from the College's success in recruiting generally younger, highly qualified and nationally recognized faculty during the early part of the decade, before New York City's fiscal crisis and the massive retrenchment of younger faculty in 1976. After 1976, the motivation to create attractive alternatives to the traditional liberal arts programs was tied to the decline of student enrollment in the liberal arts at City College in the wake of the fiscal crisis and the imposition of tuition. The discouraging trend of rapidly falling student enrollment in the traditional liberal arts disciplines, especially in the latter part of the decade, spurred the highly tenured and older liberal arts faculty to search for new directions in the liberal arts curriculum, with some interesting results that will be described in §3.

During the period of growth of student enrollment at City College - essentially 1970-76 - when both the ethnic mix and academic mix of the student body were rapidly changing, a series of alternatives to the traditional liberal arts curriculum was introduced, some requiring only minor changes within a department's curriculum, others requiring major curricular changes and even new administrative structures. I cannot do justice to the richness of imagination and innovation that was manifested during the 1970-76 period but I can discuss briefly several examples.

One interesting development took place in the History Department, where an outside Chairman, Herbert Gutmann, was brought in from the University of Rochester in an attempt to heal the factionalism within that department over Open Admissions and curricular development. Professor Gutmann was a firm believer in academic innovation with quality control in order to meet the educational needs of the changing student body and the changing city. Under his direction, a new course was developed in the History Department: "History 100-Introduction to the Study of History." This course was based on a sensitivity to the student's prior experience with history, namely to the deadening memorization of events so often stressed in its instruction on the secondary level. The course tried to reintroduce the subject of history and take a fresh look at the discipline. Students explored the possibilities of personal or family biographies, went to primary sources such as personal letters, newspapers and magazines, and investigated particular events at close range. In all instances, the questions of how man, institutions and ideas change with the passage of time, were emphasized.

Professor Gutmann also set in motion a program in Social History - through the introduction of several courses - that spelled out the relationships of liberal arts to the students' own social and cultural backgrounds. Student teams were trained in the techniques of Oral History and sent into their communities to gather the reminiscences of the people of these communities. The particular focus was to be on those older people whose memories span much of the twentieth century, men and women whose experiences and impressions were directly related to the major historical forces of modern times. The uniqueness of City College for this purpose was obvious since the College's student body had its roots in so many different ethnic and racial groups whose history it would be interesting to examine. The program in Social History was slow in gathering momentum, because of the unexpected departure of Professor Gutmann from City College at the height of the fiscal crisis. However, the program acquired new leadership under Professor James Watts, and should begin to realize its full potential as an experiment in non-traditional liberal arts education.

An example of non-traditional liberal arts innovation at the masters level was the initiation of a program in "Creative Writing" in September 1971. At that time, the program was one of the few of its kind in the country and was designed to offer young writers the opportunity to develop their creative abilities under the tutelage of distinguished visiting writers. The program offered limited enrollment workshops in fiction, poetry and drama for course credit determined by the nature of the students' projects. Each student was expected to complete a publishable full-length manuscript. Nearly half the credits required for the Master of Arts degree in Creative Writing were taken in traditional graduate literature courses offered by the English Department in order to familiarize students with the literary traditions within which they were writing. As a starter, the College secured the services of poet Gwendolyn Brooks, novelists John Hawkes and Joseph Heller, and dramatist Israel Horovitz to serve as 'Distinguished Visiting Writers' in this program. In later years, writers like Anthony Burgess, Kurt Vonnegut, and others spent a year with the program. The Creative Writing program has done very well in stimulating and developing creative talent in fiction, poetry and drama. With the completion of Aaron Davis Hall, the home of the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts, and the identification of additional resources by the College, the Creative Writing program could take a quantum jump in excitement by expanding opportunities for apprentice writers in those areas (e.g. theatre and film) where their creative output can actually be transformed into actual performance by the personnel of the Leonard Davis Center of Performing Arts using the facilities of Aaron Davis Hall.

This brings us to what is undoubtedly the major accomplishment during the Seventies by the liberal arts faculty in developing a highly attractive alternative to the traditional liberal arts curriculum, namely the creation of the Leonard Davis Center of Performing Arts with its new degree program [Bachelor of Fine Arts (B.F.A.)] in theatre, music, film and dance. Without the generous gift of $2.5 million from Leonard and Sophie Davis, for the programmatic endowment of a Center for Performing Arts, the performing arts would have continued to limp along as the "poor relatives" in the existing liberal arts departments (and certainly with no professional B.F.A. degree program). But the fact is that once the gift was announced (augmented by an additional $250,000 from Arnold

Picker for the Picker Film Institute in the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts), the liberal arts faculty rose to the challenging and exciting task of designing new curricula for the programs in theatre, music, film and dance. Indeed, the first Acting Director of the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts, which began to function in September 1972, was Arthur Waldhorn, the same senior faculty member in the English Department whose youthful spirit conceived of the Pilot Program in Humanistic Studies.

Under Waldhorn's acting directorship, the first committees were set up with enthusiastic colleagues from the Speech and Theatre Department (later this department was bifurcated into the Theatre Arts Department and the Speech Department), the Music Department, the English Department and a miscellany of consultants from the metropolitan New York area. These committees responded creatively to their charge: to shape programs at the College that would graduate highly skilled artists who not only would have experienced rigorous, specialized training but also would have encountered a broad range of academic study and interdisciplinary work in other performing arts. The successful completion of this mission took most of the decade but when everything was in place - including the dedication of Aaron Davis Hall in October 1979 - marvelous vistas were opened up for hundreds of City College students in non-traditional liberal arts education.

The full story is a fascinating one but I shall only touch briefly on the highlights. The first permanent Director of the

188

Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts was Herman Krawitz, whose practical experience as Assistant Manager under Rudolph Bing at the Metropolitan Opera House, paid handsome dividends to the College in the beautiful and functional design of Aaron Davis Hall (with its Proscenium Theatre seating 750, its Experimental Theatre seating 300, and its Laboratory Theatre seating approximately 100 persons) that he worked out with the chief architect, Abraham Geller. Krawitz stayed for about two years and was succeeded by Earle Gister, who came to City College from the Chairmanship of the Theatre Arts Department at the Carnegie-Mellon University. Gister completed the academic design of the programs in the Leonard Davis Center as they are now operating. There is no time to go into the campaign that had to be waged to overcome the opposition of the private performing arts "conservatories" in New York City to the establishment of the B.F.A. program in its public sector of higher education. The trials and tribulations of seeing the construction of Aaron Davis Hall through to completion are covered in Chapter 8.

Here, I should like to summarize the curricular innovations introduced under the rubric of the Leonard Davis Center that exemplify in so felicitous a fashion the adaptation of the liberal arts to a changing urban environment. The programs in theatre, music, film and dance in the Leonard Davis Center were designed specifically to satisfy the interests of students in the College's multiethnic, urban setting and to emphasize practical experience that would prepare students for jobs in their various chosen fields. The Leonard Davis Center is committed to prepare talented students for entrance into the commerical world of the performing arts and, during its four-year undergraudate program, encourages each student to explore the performing arts in relation to his or her own special capabilities and particular cultural background. The requirements for the B.F.A. degree in theatre, music, film and dance should provide students with programs which give them sufficient practical and theoretical training to prepare them for professional careers in each of the four areas.

There is a second track designed for students whose interest in the performing arts is not primarily directed toward a professional career at the completion of their undergraduate work. The Leonard Davis Center provides such students who wish to obtain a B.A. degree, with programs that give them sufficient practical experience in a preferred performing arts discipline, along with more traditional academic work. Thus, courses in the discipines of acting, film, dance, or music are supplemented with courses in history, literature and theory. After completing this course of studies, graduates may choose either to pursue graduate work for the M.A. and/or Ph.D. degrees, or to enter professional training at the M.F.A. level. By providing two tracks of programming for students whose interest in the performing arts is either professional or avocational, the Leonard Davis Center allows maximum flexibility for students to move into professional work from academic work, or vice versa.

The keen sensitivity of the City College faculty to the multi-ethnic, urban setting of the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts is further demonstrated by a few specifics about each of the four programs. Thus, acting students at the Leonard Davis Center study the whole range of drama, but the emphasis of the Theatre program is on the crafts most essential for working in the theatre of today. Furthermore, the Leonard Davis Center provides students from multi-ethnic backgrounds with a training whose scope, including the classic as well as the contemporary, will permit them to enter the professional world of theatre without the stigma of being "typed" in one sort of role or another.

For music students, the Leonard Davis Center offers a solid foundation in theory and practice of classical music, but also trains them in the special requirements -- sight reading, improvization, jazz and popular styles -- required for the studio musician, the contemporary vocalist, and the pop/jazz media. This is the only program in the CUNY system which specializes in preparing singers for work in clubs and musicians for work in recording studios, pit orchestras and jazz ensembles.

Film students follow a unique combination of courses in film production and courses that emphasize historical, aesthetic and critical approaches to the cinema. A dozen junior and a dozen senior students in the Picker Film Institute are able to work in 16 mm, instead of the usual 8 mm provided by most academic film programs. Graduates are equipped for responsible creative positions on professional film production crews, but at the same time have developed a rich appreciation of the historical context of their professional work.

Finally, dance students must assimilate the basic techniques of both ballet and modern dance, but they also supplement that training with contemporary dance forms -- jazz, tap, folk, African and South American. The scope of the program aims to prepare students for assuming responsible positions within community dance centers or, if they are qualified, in dance companies.

The City College can be justly proud of the dedication and cooperation of the liberal arts faculty that made possible the continuous growth of the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts, even when it was compelled to operate out of temporary facilities in the Great Hall. As the talented young people practice and perform in the three theatres of the architecturely beautiful and acousticly excellent Aaron Davis Hall, what glorious careers lie in store for a goodly number of the College's future B.F.A.'s. If the City College of olden days could produce Edward G. Robinson, Zero Mostel, Yip Harburg, Sam Jaffe, Paddy Chayevsky, and countless other luminaries in the performing arts world without a Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts, I should think that the roster of City College alumni who are professionals in the performing arts in the year 2000 will be much richer in celebrities.

§3 New Directions in Liberal Arts Education

In the previous section, I recounted how concerned and interested faculty attempted to develop some genuine alternatives to the traditional liberal arts curriculum, or at least to take a very broad view of the scope of the liberal arts disciplines, perhaps in the direction of the creative and performing arts. As I have already remarked, such attempts were acceptable and viable during the early part of the decade because of the growth in student population and in the number of faculty (particularly at the lower ranks). After the retrenchment crisis of the Summer of 1976, the precipitous decline of student enrollment in the liberal arts gave urgency to the quest for new directions in liberal arts education but these new directions would now have to possess the quality of fusion and integration with other disciplines (whether in liberal arts or pre-professional studies) rather than alternatives or enlargement of scope. The tenured and older liberal arts faculty (the percentage of tenured faculty increased markedly, from about 60% before 1976 to about 90% by 1978) expressed a greater willingness to recognize that a liberalizing education need not be congruent with a particular series of courses traditionally supposed to provide a liberal arts education. There was also increasing initiative on the part of the liberal arts faculty to design new courses and programs which would balance their concern for tradition and preservation of values with the needs of the modern world for persons trained to innovate and improvise in a cultural and societal situation without precedent. This movement toward new directions for the liberal arts curriculum was further reinforced at City College by the 1976 Middle States Report. This report stated that:

> "...the idea of adding professional education to the liberal arts is difficult but possible. It will not happen at City College, or any other institution, without a very firm commitment on the part of the faculty backed by some 'tender loving care' by administrators. The effort will also require an enhanced commitment to academic advising for students and a greatly augmented career placement service..."

Prior to the Middle States Report, I had assumed that the faculty of the College of Arts and Science at City College was too proud and self-reliant to welcome my active involvement in the academic decision-making of its (Faculty) Council. I had chosen instead to focus the efforts of my office - on the academic side - in helping to design the new centers and institutes falling under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model. The Middle States Report told me that my "laissez-faire" approach to the College of Arts and Science was being interpreted as a lack of interest and support for its centrality to the mission of City College. Quite the contrary! The importance of liberal arts in an undergraduate curriculum was a view that I deeply held and wholeheartedly endorsed. For example, I had taken the leadership role in 1974 in attempting to persuade the Planning Committee for the National Humanities Center (NHC) to locate this Center in the metropolitan New York area. My argument was that such a location could be highly consistent with one of the major purposes of the NHC, namely to orient the disciplinary skills of the humanist to the present and future as well as toward the past, toward society as well as toward the discipline. Furthermore, I argued that a metropolitan New York location would facilitate the basic interdisciplinary thrust proposed by the Planning Committee of the NHC - the extension of the humanist's concern beyond the traditional boundaries of disciplinary studies to the areas of public policy formulation, the development of new educational models, thematic studies, and perhaps, to problem-solving activities. I had even succeeded in identifying a very desirable office building in close proximity to the New York Public Library (at 42 Street) which was offered as a gift to house the NHC. To my regret, the decision was finally taken by the Planning Committee to locate the NHC amid the rural surroundings of the Research Triangle of North Carolina, but the exercise was a measure of my strong desire to enhance the stature of liberal arts at City College (and in the other higher educational institutions of metropolitan New York).

I took the Middle States recommendations very seriously and began to participate on a regular basis in the deliberations of the Faculty Council of the College of Liberal Arts and Science during the academic year 1976-77, lending my support to the adoption of a core curriculum that replaced the unstructured curriculum created by the faculty in the mid-Sixties. This core curriculum, established at City College beginning in 1977, attempted to ensure that all students enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts and Science would graduate with the broad conceptualizations of human experience that characterize general education. The core sequence (exclusive of the science part) sought to:

> 1) study language as central to the development of the individual and instrumental in social change; 2) define what literature is and explore its relationship to human existance; 3) provide an introduction to the principles of the fine and performing arts; 4) examine the relations between the human personality, society and the physical world from the perspective of philosophy and behavioral science; 5) present an integration of political and economic analyses with comparative and historical methods; 6) give students an insight into both the diversity and commonality of world civilizations and cultures; and finally 7) expose City College students to the overriding realities of Urban America.

By adding goals 6) and 7), the liberal arts core tried to emphasize the particular importance of global and urban concerns to a liberal education at City College.

More specifically, the College of Arts and Science in 1977 replaced a very permissive distribution approach to general education with two core curriculum tracks: Core A and Core B. Core A was less adventurous and simply mandated a reduced "menu" of departmental offerings within the distribution mode that together would further the seven goals enumerated above as well as expose the student to the basic concepts, methodology and values of science. Core B was a truly innovative, multi-disciplinary general education core of ten semester courses at the lower division level and two semester courses at the upper division level. The Core B courses in the humanities were: "Language and Communication", "Literature in the Human Experience", and "The Arts: Understanding and Experience" and evidently complied with goals 1) to 3) respectively. Similarly, the Core B courses in social science were "Individual, World and Society", "Political Economy", "World Civilizations and Cultures" and "Realities of Urban America" thereby complying with goals 4) to 7) respectively. Finally, in science, Core B on the lower division level contained a three-course interdisciplinary sequence on "Man and Nature", which studied the biological basis of life and the physical sciences. The upper division courses in Core B were a choice of two out of three courses: a humanities course entitled "Illusion Versus Reality: Myth, Imagination and the Human Experience", a social science course entitled "Values and Decision-Making" and a science course entitled "Science, Technology and Human Values". In my view, the City College Core B curriculum went further than the well-publicized Harvard core curriculum in providing a structured general education for students that, quoting the Harvard Prospectus, would "meet the needs of the late twentieth century".

Despite the important step forward with the adoption of the multidisciplinary Core B curriculum, I was concerned that many students would perceive the Core B courses in the liberal arts as unrelated to their professional objectives and that many faculty would steer students into the more traditional Core A curriculum. In order to ensure that both students and faculty would give the innovative Core B curriculum an opportunity to demonstrate its value as a serious option for liberal arts majors, it seemed wise to provide incentives to both students and faculty to view the Core B curriculum as an integral part of the total and desirable undergraduate program. In discussing this problem with the then Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Dr. Alice Chandler, she suggested designing a variety of new pre-professional programs that would lead to B.A. or B.S. degrees in the College of Liberal Arts and Science and that would forge a clear link between pre-professional studies and liberal arts.

I should clarify a point of nomenclature here. I use the term liberal arts in the same sense that the National Endowment for Humanities uses the term "humanities": to include those disciplines that are almost always included in a "humanities" division, school or college (i.e. literature, languages, the arts, philosophy) plus those disciplines that deal with the non-quantitative (i.e. non-scientific) aspects of the human condition - both individual and societal - and that are usually grouped under a social science division, school or college (including history, anthropology, sociology, economics). Under this definition, the term "liberal arts" would include the ethnic studies disciplines as well. At City

College, the Humanities Division of the College of Arts and Science includes the language departments, literature programs, the arts (both fine and performing), the Asian and Jewish Studies Departments but does not include the Philosophy department which is part of the Social Science Division. In addition to the Philosophy Department, the Social Science Division at City College includes all the standard social science departments as well as the History Department, the Black Studies and Puerto Rican Studies Departments. In many academic quarters, history, literature and philosophy are regarded as the central core of the humanities; at City College, this would automatically involve the Humanities and Social Science Divisions. To avoid confusion, I shall use the term "liberal arts", with the understanding that it covers the same intellectual disciplines as the term "humanities" does for the NEH. (The existence of the National Endowment for the Arts, with its separate jurisdiction over the performing arts, would imply that the performing arts are not subsumed under "liberal arts" for the purposes of the following discussion.)

In any case, I welcomed Provost Chandler's initiative during the academic year 1976-77 and she proposed to Dr. Gross, then serving as Acting Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement, that a Planning Grant be requested from NEH - preliminary to a Development Grant of major proportions - in order to articulate the new directions in liberal arts education that seemed so hopeful and helpful to the future of the College. With considerable enthusiasm, Dr. Gross drafted Professor Saul Brody of the English Department to assist him with the preparation of a proposal for a Planning Grant entitled

"Humanities, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy" (the term "humanities" was used here in the sense of the NEH, i.e. as identical with "liberal arts"). In their NEH proposal, Gross and Brody addressed the following realities at City College:

1. Studies in the humanities did not seem central to the pressing concerns of many students and even some faculty, a condition consistent with the downgrading of such studies as a central element in the curriculum.

2. Pre-professional studies tended to neglect the connections between traditional ethical issues and contemporary human problems -- a tendency reinforced by the inability of many faculty to deal in the classroom with questions of ethics and values. Accordingly, curricular and programmatic changes would be necessary if the College were to succeed in helping students relate their career needs to the issues raised by the humanities. The changes should take place not only in the core requirement and the traditional humanities curriculum, but also should include the direct introduction of humanistic concerns into pre-professional programs.

3. A variety of developing and existing programs in professional areas were deeply concerned with public policy, and ways should be found to elicit the connections between contemporary public policy issues and concerns central to the humanities.

4. City College had a large minority student population - a population composed of Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Asians, Greeks, Ukranians, Serbo-Croations, and others. Many of these students came to the College with long cultural traditions of their own, but cultural traditions that were endangered in an alien and segmented urban society. Many of them had lost any connection to their older cultures. Some students came with few resources for fitting into the bewildering and often hostile life of a vast metropolis. Limited by economic and social pressures, they came to the College without even the means to share the rich cultural life of the city. Consequently, large numbers of City College students pursued the only road open to them; deeply concerned with economic survival, they aspired to the immediate rewards of pre-professional and vocational studies and bypassed the less tangible promise of the humanities.

Having delineated the basic philosophy of the proposed new direction in liberal arts education at City College, Gross and Brody stated that the NEH Planning Grant would support a sustained faculty planning effort to design five emerging career programs concerned with public policy issues that would be closely integrated with the humanities. The five emerging career programs listed as suitable for development under the NEH Planning Grant were: "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy", "Energy, Ecology and Environment"; "Public Policy and Public Service"; "Human Development"; and "Administration and Management". (The first three programs - which have evolved at different rates - are described below; the last two programs have receded in priority compared to two other programs that are described below.) The novelty of the proposal - from the vantage point of NEH - was the rather persuasive argument that public policy issues were related fundamentally to issues central to the humanities: the ways the past shapes the present, the ways a society changes and acts on its values, the tension between individual and societal needs.

The NEH Planning Grant was awarded at the beginning of the academic year 1977-78 and Dean of Humanities Gross (Gross had returned as Dean from his position the previous year as Acting Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement) became the principle investigator and Professor Brody became the Program Coordinator. Faculty committees for each of the sub-programs enumerated above were activated to develop courses of study in which the humanities formed an important part of career training. An ongoing and significant part of the work during this planning year was the design of a senior level course by a Joint Committee of representatives of each of the subcommittees. One result of the Joint Committee's efforts was experimentation with a Senior Capstone Seminar entitled "Public Policy and Human Values," whose goal was to bring together students to deal with the ethical and moral implications of the ways in which public policy was formulated and implemented. The course departed in at least two radical ways from traditional offerings: first, by combining students and faculty from a variety of departments into a single seminar, it was aggressively multi-disciplinary; second, it offered students the chance to participate in a complex, sophisticated computer simulation exercise.

In the simulation seminar, students assumed roles crucial to the life of a simulated city and county called Metro-Apex. They became city or country planners or politicians, industrial managers, land developers, environmental advocates or environmental agency bureaucrats, or representatives of the mass media. Through their interaction with each other, the paradigmatic residents of Metro-Apex tried to achieve certain goals for their community. At the end, the computer measured the results of the decisions in terms of changed land values, employment, income, tax revenues, air and water pollution, and a multitude of other variables. Through this exercise, students were given both the experience of having to determine public policy within the constraints typically imposed by inadequate time, information, and budget -- and the opportunity to examine the impact of their decisions on the life of the community. Drawing upon this experience, and also upon required readings and guest speakers with professional experiences in roles that paralleled the exercise roles, the students assessed the broad ethical and philosophical dimensions of public policy decision-making. Departments involved in the "Public Policy and Human Values" seminar included English, Biology, Economics, and Sociology.

The NEH Planning Grant was used well and brought into play some truly innovative faculty thinking to meet the deepest needs of students committed to pre-professional education. By emphasizing the pivotal role of the humanities in the curriculum, by bringing students to see the importance of our culture's lasting values, and by encouraging the broad-based thinking that would make it possible to cope with the rapid changes of the contemporary world, the Planning Grant in "Humanities, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy" held out the promise of catalyzing significant changes in the traditional humanities curriculum. However, the continuation of this program depended entirely on funding from non-tax-levy sources and, by April 1978, Gross and Brody returned from Washington with the impression that the chances of a followup Development Grant from NEH for this program were dim.

From the outset, I was a strong supporter of this more structured and valuable attempt to develop meaningful new directions in liberal arts education. Since it appeared necessary to search elsewhere for funding for this program in late Spring of 1978, I discussed with appropriate deans and faculty some alterations in the original design of the Program in "Humanities, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy" (by this time, Gross had resigned as Dean of Humanities and bowed out as principal investigator of the NEH Planning Grant). The result was a modified proposal entitled "Liberal Arts, Pre-

Professional Studies and Public Policy" (LAPP) which constituted a further refinement and enlargement of the basic concepts and methodologies of the earlier program. By substituting the phrase "liberal arts" for "humanities", the new proposal gave explicit recognition to the expectation that the Humanities Division and the Social Science Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Science would be equally involved in the development of a group of closely articulated multidisciplinary programs integrating the liberal arts and clusters of pre-professional courses. The LAPP proposal also made provision for the appointment of three distinguished generalists in the liberal arts disciplines, say in Moral Philosophy, in Public Policy, and in Social Criticism, who would help to mold the set of LAPP programs into the exciting and vibrant educational venture that was being projected. The LAPP proposal was the final and most ambitious step in the College's efforts to develop an integrated liberal arts - pre-professional studies program during my term of office. Since time was of the essence (the necessary funding had to be secured from the Mellon Foundation) and the faculty was dispersed (the time was June, 1978), I personally prepared the first draft of the proposal with the assistance of Provost Chandler, Dean of Social Science Arthur Tiedemann and Professor Brody. By October 1978, the Mellon Foundation had allocated approximately one half million dollars for the implementation of the LAPP Programs during a three-year period.

The Mellon Grant provided ample resources for a major redefinition of new directions in liberal arts education at City College. Three of the five LAPP Programs were essentially identical with the programs covered by the NEH Planning Grant, namely "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy", "Energy, Ecology and Environment" and "Public Policy and Public Service". Two others, "Health, Medicine and Society" and "Justice, Law and Society" were intended to be obvious "spinoffs" of the College's Biomedical Program and Urban Legal Studies Program respectively, and replaced the somewhat more specialized "Human Development" and "Administration and Management" programs included under the NEH Planning Grant. (It was always understood - and it was stated so in the LAPP proposal - that the five pre-professional programs listed were merely the initial candidates for development under the overarching program in "Liberal Arts, Pre-Professional Studies and Public Policy.")

The first program, in "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy", was intended to achieve the following goals:

1) To give students a solid grounding in the liberal arts so that they could function not simply as practitioners of a discipline but also as liberally educated citizens; 2) To preserve the liberal arts tradition in a pre-professional program by developing competence in language skills -- the means by which the tradition was transmitted and understood; 3) To educate students in the fundamental theories, principles and practices of mass communication, in all media; 4) To educate students in the complex and critical relationships between mass communications and society. This was to be accomplished by providing them with a working knowledge of the social sciences relevant to the field, and by introducing them to the study both of the mass media's effects upon society and the pertinent ethical issues; 5) To develop a special concern for public policy as an appropriate emphasis for those who would be future mass communicators; 6) To equip students with the necessary knowledge and skills for a career in mass communications.

The program in "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy" was an excellent example of how the LAPP programs were supposed to operate. On the one hand, the multi-disciplinary curriculum for the program was so designed that students were made aware of communications as a humanizing process - how individuals, societies and cultures created and used symbolic environments, and how words and images evoked meaning, transformed knowledge, and shaped consciousness. On the other hand, the pre-professional clusters of courses were so combined that students could specialize in one of two areas: Broadcasting, or Print and Electronic Journalism. Students specializing in Broadcasting could choose from course offerings which included: Foundation of Broadcasting, Radio-Television Production, Broadcast Documentary and Broadcast Journalism. Students specializing in Print and Electronic Journalism could take courses such as: Journalistic Writing, Feature Article Writing and Copy Editing. In their senior year students would be placed in internships in the two speciality fields under faculty supervision. Like every student registered in a LAPP program, students would have to take the Senior Capstone Seminar on "Public Policy and Human Values".

The Program in "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy" was actually started in September 1977 as a free-standing program but its full potential will only be realized as an integral part of the comprehensive LAPP set of programs. When the communications program was announced, more than 200 students identified themselves as communications majors, immediately converting it into the largest B.A. program in the Humanities Division, under whose aegis it operates. This outpouring of student interest was very encouraging and is expected to be typical of the other LAPP programs. It should be pointed out that a "Center for Communications and Public Policy" was one of the four centers conceived under the Urban Educational Model (the other three being the Center for Biomedical Education, the Center for Legal Education and the Center for Performing Arts) and that the program in "Communications, Mass Media and Public Policy" achieved at least some of the objectives of that Center. While the Communications Program fell short of being a full-fledged center, it was serving the College well as the pacesetter for the LAPP Programs.

The second LAPP program, in "Energy, Ecology and Environment", was planned to be an interdisciplinary major administered by the Division of Science (of the College of Arts and Science). It was designed to achieve three main objectives:

1) To provide students interested in environmental studies with the skills needed for work as environmentalists in a variety of fields; 2) To give students a solid grounding in the liberal arts so that they will be prepared to confront questions of conflicting values, legal precedents, and social mechanisms as part of the work of the practicing environmentalist; 3) To develop a special concern for public policy as a way of bridging the study of the liberal arts and environmental education.

The LAPP Program in "Energy, Ecology and Environment" would contain an environmental core curriculum and a sequence of courses in one aspect of environmental studies. The core curriculum would consist of two lower division colloquia on "Man and the Environment" and a cluster of three elective courses that would provide a broad overview of the scope and content of the field. The sequence of courses comprising the upper division studies in the Program would offer one of four possible environmantal career tracks: Environmental Quality, Environmental Health, Environmental Education, and Resources and Energy. In their senior year, students in this Program would also participate in the Capstone Seminar on "Public Policy and Human Values" required of all LAPP students.

The third LAPP program, in "Public Policy and Public Service," was being designed to prepare students for entry level professional positions in public policy and public service, that is, in non-profit organizations and government agencies. Students enrolled in this Program should be able to maintain a major in one of the College's departments and would therefore be graduated with a specialization in Public Policy and Public Service Studies as well as a major in an existing department. The humanistic perspective of the program was intended to be very strong throughout. Students would be following courses in the History of Policy, Political Ethics, Sociology, Political Science, Decision-Making and Economics.

The fourth of the LAPP Programs, in "Health, Medicine, and Society" - already in operation - was designed to prepare students for careers in health administration and in health-related human services. On receiving their bachelor's degrees, some students would be able to start careers in the lower echelons of health administration, or would begin to work directly with patients in need of health-related human services. The core of this LAPP program involved a series of interdisciplinary courses in the American health care system and contemporary health problems, and a field work course in health care administration. To this core were added special electives in Economics, Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology and Ethnic Studies that would broaden the student's awareness of other disciplines related to his or her professional objectives.

There is a deep need for health professionals trained in liberal arts as well as in technical subjects, in order that they can acquire a wide perspective from which to understand their work and thus become more enlightened and proficient professionals. The LAPP Program in "Health, Medicine and Society" would satisfy such a need.

The fifth and last of the initial package of proposed LAPP programs, "Justice, Law and Society", was intended for pre-law students and for those interested in para-legal professional careers serving the public sector. The scheme of liberal arts courses which students would be taking in this program would be selected from course offerings of the Departments of Political Science and Philosophy, as well as selected courses in Psychology, Sociology, and Classics. In addition to those courses, students in this LAPP program would be taking in their junior year a required two-semester sequence that would introduce them to the legal process, legal analysis, and the use of legal materials, while simultaneously introducing them to the historical, philosophical and sociological contexts of the law. During their senior year, they would be taking a special advanced level course in "Justice, Law, and Society", using the case study approach, supplemented by an internship experience.

As mentioned earlier, the curricula of all LAPP students would culminate in the Senior Capstone Seminar on "Public Policy and Human Values," designed to permit them to share the skills and insights gained during their earlier years and to explore the relationships existing among ordinarily separate disciplines.

The Capstone Course would be team-taught by faculty from a variety of disciplines. One part of the course would deal with three or four major social issues confronting contemporary society, seen from multiple points of view: that of the scientist, that of the social scientist, and that of the humanist. Another part of the course, following the case study approach, would enable the students to participate in solving problems that beset contemporary urban society.

The set of LAPP Programs was presented to the Mellon Foundation in the belief that one of the most promising means of stimulating enrollment in liberal arts at an institution like City College is to demonstrate their primacy in pre-professional education. But the purpose went much deeper. The purpose of the LAPP programs was to help City College students relate the ethical lessons of literature, philosophy, and history to the great human problems raised by their own urban environment. Today's City College students must be armed with professional skills and humanistic vision, for they will make tomorrow's public policy decisions. They will determine the quality of life in New York City and even the survival of the city itself. It is for these reasons that the students of an urban university like City College have a special need for a liberal arts-centered curriculum and a commitment to values. It seemed to me that the Mellon Foundation provided the liberal arts faculty with a glorious opportunity to develop new directions for liberal arts in an urban environment and to take those imaginative leaps forward that would usher in a new and enormously significant era in liberal arts education at the College.

Chapter 5

"Ethnicity, Ethnic Studies and the Third World"

§1 The New Ethnicity and Genesis of the Ethnic Studies Departments

Ethnicity has played an important role at City College since the year of its founding. When Townsend Harris argued in 1847 for the establishment of a Free Academy to serve the children of the "poor, the immigrant and the disadvantaged", he was trying to create the possibility of upward mobility for the poor Irish and other "White Ethnics" from Northern and Western Europe into the mainstream of American society. And when Col. James Watson Webb (whose son Alexander, later became the second president of City College) was leading the opposition to Townsend Harris with the ringing denunciation that the Free Academy would "be onerous to the City finances, injurious to institutions of learning already established, the fruitful source of strife among different classes and religious sects, and almost useless for all purposes of good", he was registering his view that the concept of upward mobility for the "White Ethnics" should be rejected. It should be noted that when City College was founded, slavery was still in existence in the United States. By the beginning of this century and through World War II, the majority of "White Ethnic" students receiving their education at City College were children of Jews from Eastern Europe and the Russian empire.

It is fair to say that throughout the first century of its existence, while City College was providing higher educational opportunities for the "White Ethnics", the idea of introducing ethnic studies into the curriculum in a serious way was never considered. I am no expert in social analysis but I would guess that the "melting pot" ideal was invented by the dominant (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) group in American society during this period in order to achieve some semblance of national unity among the successive waves of immigrants flocking to the shores of this country. Furthermore, so the argument must have gone, the United States was so preoccupied with the development of its own national culture, that it could hardly divert resources to support the cultural diversity of the "old world". Consequently, before World War II, the quest for cultural identity among white ethnic groups did not receive expression through the curricular process in academe. The thrust in academe - even in educationally innovative institutions like Columbia College which I attended - was to expose young Americans to liberal arts, professional studies and interdisciplinary courses that focused on the values and achievements of Western civilization. When I took the famous required course in "Contemporary Civilization" at Columbia College several years prior to the outbreak of World War II, it was devoted exclusively to the intellectual history of Western Europe since the year 1200. The values and achievements of "Eastern" and "Southern" civilizations were given short shrift in the undergraduate training of the Columbia student in those years.

World War II changed the ethnic picture drastically both domestically and on a global scale. The overwhelming victory by the United States catalyzed dynamic demographic changes in its own society and the collapse of the Western European empires in the Third World brought an international dimension to the "new ethnicity" in our country. The internal and external migrations of Blacks to American urban areas rapidly gathered momentum and the "new ethnics" were joined in New York City by a large Puerto Rican influx (and other Hispanic groups) and, after 1965 (when the Immigration Act was modified), by increasing numbers of Asians. The new ethnic groups in New York City and elsewhere in the country were wary of the old "melting pot" ideal. Instead, fueled by the Civil Rights Movement of the Sixties, young people demanded that academic institutions actively participate in their search to retrace ethnic and cultural roots in order better to understand contemporary experience - a clear call for alternatives to traditional liberal arts education.

As the decade of the Sixties neared its end, this demand for the academic recognition of the ethnic and cultural aspirations of the officially designated minority groups in the United States gained wide currency and, at the very time of the Black and Puerto Rican student takeover at City College, in the Spring of 1969, the Harvard Liberal Arts Faculty were voting for the creation of a new Afro-American Studies Department with the rationale:

> "We are dealing with 25 million of our own people with a special history, culture and range of problems...It can hardly be doubted that the study of Black men in America is a legitimate and urgent academic endeavor..."

It is not, therefore, surprising that at City College, with its substantially larger Black and Puerto Rican student populations, the

Five Demands in 1969 included a demand not just for a separate department of Afro-American Studies but, more far-reaching, an autonomous School of Regional and Community Affairs (along the lines of Wilfred Cartey's memorandum).

In Chapter 2, I discussed the Cartey proposal and recounted how my predecessor, Acting President Copeland, responded to that demand by establishing a separate Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies in September 1969. I tried to explain in Chapter 2 why, soon after my arrival on campus in September 1970, I began to question the viability of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies as a long-range solution to Ethnic Studies at City College despite the fact that, under Osborne Scott's Chairmanship, this department had, within one year, greatly increased the number of its students and the list of its courses. I promised a fuller account in this chapter and this I now undertake to give.

As I mentioned in Chapter 2, when I arrived at City College in September 1970, there were in existence the one-year-old Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies (UES) in the College of Liberal Arts and Science and a faculty committee charged with creating a new Program in Jewish Studies. Interest in UES and in Jewish Studies had been increasing rapidly but somewhat disjointedly at the College. When UES started in September 1969, there were two courses and 175 students; a year later there were seventeen courses and over 1000 student enrollees. Jewish students were petitioning for a separate Department of Jewish Studies and had, via the "Jewish Collective," made the creation of this department (with the designation of a particular faculty member as its chairman) a major objective; in a full page ad that the Jewish Collective ran in the student newspaper Campus, it stated:

> "We deem the study of one's heritage, history and culture essential to the individual's full development in our increasingly impersonal society..."

Some of the College's large minority of Asian students were interested in Asian Ethnic Studies and echoed the sentiments of the Jewish Collective. The Puerto Rican Student Union accused the College administration of "indifference and blatent racism" for not offering an expanded curriculum in Puerto Rican Studies and argued that the UES department had not "fulfilled the needs of the Puerto Rican students". The dissatisfaction of the Puerto Rican students with the UES department (also subjected to increasing criticism by the Black students but for other reasons) was aggravated by the city-wide social and political conflicts between the Black and Puerto Rican communities. Many things were getting mixed together: the legitimate academic concerns of ethnic studies, the intensely-felt student need to retrace ethnic and cultural roots, a strong desire by students for service in the city's various ethnic communities, the need for educational innovation with a greater emphasis on practical, work-study and service experience, and just plain politics. It was thus a major task as the year unfolded to get a measure of these forces and to determine how the College could respond to them in ways that were academically sound, educationally feasible and both fiscally and politically realistic.

I should like to make it clear that the decision to establish four distinct ethnic studies departments in the Spring of 1971 was not taken lightly - neither by the Faculty Council of the College of

Liberal Arts and Science nor by me - and was only taken after several other possible avenues for dealing with the deeply emotional and widespread interest in ethnic studies had been fully explored. By the end of my first semester, I realized that the "new ethnicity" had to receive serious attention from Central Administration but I still believed that the ethnic and cultural aspirations of the various groups could be achieved more effectively without the creation of a distinct department for each major ethnic group. An Ad Hoc faculty committee which I appointed - at the behest of the Faculty Council of the College of Liberal Arts and Science - prepared a basic document that fairly accurately reflected my own thinking at that time; I quote from a section in that document entitled "Ethnic Studies as Academic Fields":

> "The College welcomes the increased interest and emphasis on ethnic and cultural studies at the College. We believe that our country, our city and our college now face a deep crisis of conscience and confidence. While not rejecting the psychological imperatives of the "melting pot" ideal, we are becoming aware of the fact that in order to become Americans we must know more about ourselves and others, and come to mutual understanding and respect for other groups in their contribution to the general culture...The College feels fully committed to one basic ideal of all liberal education: the expansion of awareness. Through programs of ethnic studies which are carefully and seriously designed, and which allow many bridges between areas of study, students can and will be led from their immediate concerns to a deeper appreciation of the human condition and a fuller understanding of social dynamics. Ethnic courses can convey both the humanistic values of revered cultural traditions and a framework for comprehending the urgency and consequence of demands for equality, dignity and justice. Ethnic and cultural studies, in short, can provide an academic framework within which students of the Seventies can learn in an immediately meaningful way the most important lessons traditionally taught by the humanities and the social sciences..."

For all of the above reasons, I could understand the vocal racial and ethnic pride that had developed among the different communities in

New York City and I could strongly support the intellectual thrust of the "new ethnicity" at the College. The overriding dilemma was whether ethnic studies could best be introduced into the curricular process at City College via the creation of a series of ethnic studies departments. I was initially inclined to the point of view, expressed so aptly several years later by Professor Irving Greenberg, Chairman of the Jewish Studies Department, which acknowledged without hesitation that "history and the upsurge of ethnic interests had broken through the previous academic framework and revealed...the Western ethnocentrism of its purportedly universal curriculum." Further, it seemed highly appropriate for the College to create a suitable mechanism for ethnic studies to:

> "express ethnic particularity and open new programs generated by group need, while meeting the disciplines of mainstream academic judgments and openness to all students and groups in the community... One test of this openness would be: could ethnic studies appoint faculty not of their own ethnic group? Joint appointments with regular departments are another way of achieving this result. Still another way is to stimulate additional ethnic study content courses in traditional departments rather than monopolizing them in ethnic studies. Thus ethnic studies help strengthen the older departments..."

I was obviously aware of the ongoing critique of ethnic studies as lacking in the intellectual rigor of regular disciplines. However, I did not share the view of some traditional departments at City College that programs in ethnic studies had to be less demanding because they would attempt to meet the legitimate cultural and social needs of minority students. Rather, it struck me that a college, which had at the beginning of the Seventies, in addition to its large number of White students, more Black students than 70% of the Black colleges in the United States, more Puerto Rican students than any senior college outside the University of Puerto Rico, and more Asian students than any American college outside California, that such an institution is ideal for an innovative configuration of ethnic studies programs. Moreover, it seemed to me that City College, with its unique ethnic mix, had the rare opportunity to use its ethnic studies programs to lead the future adults of New York City to a deeper appreciation of the ethnic and cultural complexities that mold our pluralistic society. I thought that a newly-designed interethnic course, ultimately required of all City College students, could actually work against the tendency, evident in New York City and other cities, toward ethnic divisiveness and cultural hostility.

As I noted earlier, the drive for the creation of new ethnic studies programs had itself become a politically explosive source of activity. By the winter of 1970-71, for example, members of the Puerto Rican Student's Union (PRSU) at City College were disrupting classes to make their demands heard and succeeded in briefly occupying the Romance Languages Department's Office to call attention to their demand for a separate Puerto Rican Studies Department. The PRSU accused the Romance Languages Department faculty of being racist towards Puerto Ricans and demanded that one professor, in particular, be fired. That professor had passed out to his Spanish classes an information sheet containing a list of Puerto Rican colloquialisms which the students said emphasized vulgarisms and projected a false image of the Puerto Rican people. Some of their other demands were that six new Puerto Rican professors be hired, of which one would teach Puerto Rican history and one would coordinate the SEEK program's

Spanish courses; the recurring demand for student participation in the hiring of Puerto Rican professors was also restated. Similar examples could be cited of student agitation and political pressure exerted by other ethnic groups.

Having inherited a complicated and tense situation, it was a major task of my new administration to reach definite decisions - in concert with the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Science - by the end of the first academic year. Before the end of 1970, I therefore appointed three committees of distinguished scholars to advise Central Administration on curricular aspects of the ethnic studies programs (no one had yet decided on separate departmental status). Professor Frank Bonilla of Stanford chaired the Puerto Rican Studies Advisory Committee, Professors Harold Cruse of Michigan and Charles Hamilton of Columbia served on the Black Studies Advisory Committee, and Professor-Emeritus Salo Baron of Columbia chaired the Jewish Studies Advisory Committee. These three committees formulated many interesting suggestions for curricular designs, but they also fairly consistently came up with one recommendation: that the various ethnic studies programs should be contained within separate academic departments. I was astonished by the near unanimity on this recommendation from distinguished scholars whose entire life experiences in academe led me to expect a recommendation that would provide for an institutional linkage among the various ethnic programs under consideration. In the absence of such a recommendation, I made one last effort to persuade the student (and faculty) leaders of the various ethnic groups to give serious consideration to the possibility of a "Department of Ethnic Programs" - a sort of super-department which would give an official status to every identifiable program of ethnic studies and build in a rotating chairmanship from each of the constituent ethnic studies programs. I requested my two key troubleshooters at that time, Academic Assistant Ted Brown and Assistant Provost for Community Affairs Bernard Gifford, to quietly explore this possibility with appropriate representatives of the various ethnic groups. The outcome was a complete disaster - the academic arguments were submerged by group interests. Another quote from the full page ad run by the Jewish Collective in the Campus - previously alluded to - confirms my recollection of the last-ditch effort which I made to avoid separate ethnic studies departments and communicates some sense of the confrontational atmosphere prevailing during the academic year 1970-71 when the ethnic studies question had to be resolved. The quote from the ad run by the Jewish Collective is:

> "A department of Jewish studies. Not an interdisciplinary program. Yes, we have been totally insistent on a separate department of Jewish Studies. We believe that CCNY is plagued by a unique combination of problems: endless red tape, ruthless faculty infighting and backstabbing, Jewish self-hate. We believe that this combination spells doom for anything other than a fully independent department. It should be pointed out that the President's Committee on Jewish Studies, including the select panel of outside scholars and "experts" is in complete agreement with us on this point.
>
> A department of Jewish Studies. Not a program in an *ethnic studies department* (my italics). We have - along with other ethnic groups at the College - refused to participate in the creation of one, single, umbrella-department of ethnic studies. We find such a department to be both impractical and undesirable, and we will not submit to a plan that would only force us into permanent conflict with other ethnic groups. We will not permit the administration to sit back and smile while CCNY ethnic groups destory each other over each dollar and each line in a shaky department. We will not submit to an imposed solution to genuine needs..."

With the recommendations for separate ethnic studies departments in hand and the failure to sell the advantages of a "super-department" transparently clear, Central Administration went before the Faculty Council of the College of Liberal Arts and Science on March 11, 1971, and requested that a conclusive study be made of the question of ethnic studies at City College. To this end, the Faculty Council requested the President to appoint a "Committee of Five" to consider various possibilities, and set a special meeting to act on its recommendations for April 1. After intense deliberation, this Committee unanimously recommended that the Faculty Council vote to establish separate departments of Asian, Black, Jewish, and Puerto Rican Studies. The chief arguments presented by the "Committee of Five" to the Faculty Council have more than a historical interest; I quote from the committee report:

> "We have devoted considerable time and energy to the question of independent departmental status for the four ethnic and cultural studies programs tentatively outlined above. We considered two other possibilities: tracks within a single department and interdisciplinary programs. We continually came back, however, to separate departments, for several reasons. First, we realize that the groups with which we are most immediately concerned are very different in their histories, traditions and sense of identity. On a relatively simple level, for example, there are serious differences between them in linguistic emphasis and orientation. The notion of establishing studies programs for these groups as tracks within a single department immediately raises serious difficulties, some coolly rational and others more hotly emotional. Secondly, we felt that due to these very difficulties the prospects for smooth, cooperative participation within a single department are not very good. The potential dangers of intradepartmental competition also must be seriously anticipated and appropriately reckoned with. Thirdly, we believe that the establishment of these studies programs as separate departments will greatly facilitate the raising of funds from outside sources...
>
> We also specifically opted for departmental rather than interdisciplinary program status for these studies programs, because we are convinced that unless these proposed academic structures are elevated

> to the rank of departments, the development of ethnic and cultural study at the college will be hampered considerably. It is felt that interdisciplinary programs lack the real resources and persuasiveness in the matter of initiative that the traditional independent departments have possessed. Moreover, we feel that departments are inherently more stable than interdisciplinary programs and are thus necessary to supply the needed leadership in this exciting new area of study...
>
> We are aware, nevertheless, of the potential dangers of ethnic myopia and cultural atomism. To prevent these, we have tried to build several safeguards into our proposal. Along with our basic recommendation for the creation of separate departments we intend to establish mechanisms aimed at preventing the developing of fissiparous tendencies in ethnic studies. The first mechanism we propose is the creation of a planning committee under the Chairmanship of an Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Science and consisting of the chairmen of the four ethnic studies departments. This committee will plan interdepartmental lecture series, offer collective advice on course development within the individual departments, and jointly supervise the interdepartmental courses...A key interdepartmental course would be an "Intercultural Survey Course" of two semesters' length as a basic requirement for all majors in the ethnic studies departments. It will review the history of America's major ethnic and cultural groups. Special emphasis will be placed upon groups making up New York City's population, including the Jews, Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Italians, Irish and the Chinese. The effects of economic and social class, neighborhood, national origin and religious sub-group membership in personal identification, values, attitudes, status strivings and politics will be covered. The course might even be team-taught by members of the departments of Asian Studies, Black Studies, Jewish Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, History, Sociology, and English. If this course is designed and taught well, it might even become the modern equivalent of the old "Contemporary Civilization" at Columbia College and therefore be of great interest to all of City College students..."

The Faculty Council - with several hundred intensely interested student guests present - hotly debated the Committee's recommendations. Principal arguments in favor stressed the already nationally recognized academic legitimacy of ethnic studies, the demonstrable passionate concern of many of the College's students and the obvious need for educational innovations that would bring the College close to the real interests and needs of its new student body. Opponents questioned the validity of ethnic studies as academic disciplines and doubted the wisdom of creating four separate departments, which would merely proliferate, it was feared, into additional departments. Supporters countered with the additional argument that separate departmental status was the only stable structure to ensure long-range success. Cooperation could be guaranteed, they suggested, by creating several interdepartmental bridges, including a jointly offered intercultural survey course. After lengthy debate, the Faculty Council voted by a 3 to 1 margin to abolish the UES Department and to create the separate Departments of Asian, Black, Jewish, and Puerto Rican Studies. This step was taken with the understanding that a minimal condition for creating additional departments would be at least 5% representation and intense interest on the part of the student body of the ethnic group in question. It was further understood that every effort would be made to create at the earliest possible moment the intercultural survey course and to allow for the creation of other ethnic studies offerings - e.g. Slavic and Italian Studies - within existing departments.

At a student press conference held shortly after the Faculty Council vote, I stated that:

> "I hope as a result of the creation of these departments there will be a general relaxation on the campus and that these departments will enable students to achieve an ethnic or group identity, about which they feel so strongly...I hope there will be very close cooperation between departments so that students will become aware of their common humanity..."

In concluding this section, I should like to add two postscripts. The first postscript is to acknowledge the vigorous fight that Professor Osborne Scott, Chairman of UES, carried on

222

to save his department from dissolution and to prevent the creation of the four separate ethnic studies departments. Several of Scott's statements are worth mentioning because of their cogency and perspicacity:

> "The department has been committed to the task of transcending traditional academic disciplines, and forging a community of learning which pursues cross-cultural understanding, contacts, cooperation, and mutual support...Cross-cultural ethnic studies cannot be pursued in separate departments without losing the over-arching purpose of sensitizing various ethnic groups to the place and role of each other in the total community..."

These statements did not fall on deaf ears in the President's office if one recalls my earlier remarks about the Brown-Gifford intervention. On the other hand, I had to give considerable weight to a statement by the senior Puerto Rican faculty member of UES, Professor Frederico Aquino-Bermudez, who said:

> "The Puerto Rican students are aware that every attempt made by them to improve the Puerto Rican studies as well as to institute new courses has been thwarted by most of the departments in the college. The resistance and delay to approve courses proposed by students and faculty, the lack of desire to allow the transfer of courses to the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies, they state, is a true indication of indifference and ill desire to cooperate in strengthening and making this department meaningful..."

The difference in opinion between Professors Scott and Aquino was indicative of the increasing polarization between the Black and Puerto Rican students and faculty within UES and was one of the reasons, under the circumstances prevailing at that time, for giving separate status to the Black and Puerto Rican components of UES. The problem of decision-making in this area was compounded by the fact that the two consultants brought in to evaluate the UES department, Professors Cruse and Hamilton, did not file their (very brief) report until two days before the Faculty Council meeting and too late for the "Committee of Five" to consider its recommendations. Professors Cruse and Hamilton stated that:

> "It would be far better not to create two separate departments of Black Studies and Puerto Rican Studies...the present department should be substantially revised and strengthened..."

They went on to say that the injection of Jewish studies into the urban and ethnic areas was "unfortunate inasmuch as it might tend to obscure the issue of the legitimacy of a Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies". Apart from the unfortunate lateness of the Cruse-Hamilton report, which made it difficult to fold their views into the final decision, acceptance of both of their statements could not be reconciled with the ethnic realities on the City College campus. The outcome might have been different if they had proposed at an early stage a carefully articulated blueprint of a School of Third World Studies and a Department of Jewish and Near Eastern Studies. This last possibility occurred to me at the time but I was convinced that campus dynamics eliminated this possibility without the support - which I did not have - of the distinguished intellectual leadership of the outside consultants to the various ethnic groups.

The second postscript is somewhat anti-climatic but is worth recording because of its implications for some later developments. This has to do with a meeting held in my office with a group of Black students and faculty, led by Professor Frank LaRoque (of UES), several days after the Faculty Council vote to establish the four new departments: Afro-American Studies, Asian Studies, Jewish Studies and Puerto Rican Studies beginning in September 1971. The group argued vehemently that the field of Caribbean Studies could not be subsumed under the newly-created Afro-American Studies Department but instead required the further creation of a separate Department of Caribbean Studies. Professor LaRoque, born in Haiti, insisted that the overlap between Afro-American Studies and Caribbean Studies was so minuscule, that a fifth ethnic studies department was necessary and that, furthermore, it would satisfy the Faculty Council guideline of serving an ethnic group - the West Indian Black group - which constituted at least 5% of the student body. I told LaRoque's group that I would have sufficient difficulty persuading the BHE to approve the creation of four new ethnic studies departments without seeking approval of a fifth department having only marginal justification; besides, I pointed out, the Faculty Council would have to vote to create this new department and I could not possibly conceive that the vote would be favorable. Instead, I suggested - and this finally was accepted - that the Afro-American Studies Department be renamed the Black Studies Department with three major sub-programs: Afro-American Studies, Caribbean Studies, and African Studies.

§2 Problems and Promise of the Ethnic Studies Departments

Because the decision to create the four ethnic studies departments was reached late in the 1970-71 academic year, many important steps had to be taken on a foreshortened time scale to implement them by the following September. Search committees had to be organized immediately to find chairmen for the new departments; faculty-student Steering & Planning Committees had to be established to start putting departmental affairs in order and to act in the crucial matter of curriculum; and new faculty had to be hired. All this was attempted chiefly during the Summer of 1971 with easily predicted partial success. The Puerto Rican Studies Department was successful in identifying Professor Aquino as its first fulltime chairman; the other departments, however, were able to recruit only part-time chairmen to serve as heads of faculty-student Steering and Planning Committees. These individuals were Professor B. N. Varma of City College (Sociology) in Asian Studies, Professor Charles Hamilton of Columbia (Political Science) in Black Studies, and Professor Eugene Borowitz of Hebrew Union College (Hebrew Letters) in Jewish Studies. Even with this temporary leadership structure for three of the four departments, all four departments had sufficient courses ready by September 1971 to begin operation. But, during the 1971-72 academic year, each department was given a mandate to develop curricula for majors, recruit faculty, stabilize its internal affairs and, in three cases, to recruit a new chairman.

§2a Puerto Rican Studies Department

Each of the four Ethnic Studies Department developed along different lines, depending upon its view of the target student population, its openness to interaction with traditional departments (especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences), its particular philosophy with regard to curricular emphasis on ethnic heritage courses, community service-related disciplines or area studies, availability of qualified faculty who were willing to become associated with the evolving intellectual discipline of ethnic studies, and prior momentum at City College.

Since the Puerto Rican Studies Department had its permanent chairman in place by September 1971, it was in the best position to recruit new faculty, to design its curriculum for majors and to stabilize its operation. Professor Aquino proceeded to do all that and the measure of his success is confirmed by the fact that he was still Chairman of the Puerto Rican Studies Department at the time that I left City College eight years after his appointment.

Professor Aquino took a very broad and balanced point of view about the role of the Puerto Rican Studies Department in the life of City College. Courses were designed to encourage non-Puerto Rican as well as Puerto Rican students to be interested in taking them, cooperation of the Puerto Rican Studies Department in joint projects with other departments and programs was a matter of principle and was carried out extensively in practice (e.g. the Bilingual-Bicultural Program in the School of Education, the Latin American Studies Program in the College of Liberal Arts and Science, the Biomedical Program, the Urban Legal Studies Program, etc.), and the desire to maintain the academic respectability of the curriculum became a matter of established policy.

This is not to say that the Puerto Rican Studies Department was without its share of problems: 1) A minority of the Puerto Rican students at City College had very strong political convictions about the future destiny of their land of birth (namely, they were "Independista" in their orientation). On occasion, these students attempted to convert the Puerto Rican Studies Department into a political base of operations. In this, they failed because of Aquino's strongly-held view (supported by the majority of his Executive Committee) that the Puerto Rican Studies Department should be an academic department. 2) The existence, during the period 1971-76, of the Office of Puerto Rican Planning and Development under Ms. Yolanda Sanchez, tended to introduce some confusion into the community outreach "practicum" function of the Puerto Rican Studies Department, i.e. the infusion of the community field experience component into certain departmental courses. This jurisdictional overlap ceased after 1976, when the Puerto Rican Program Planning and Development Office had to be retrenched. 3) The creation of the Puerto Rican Research Institute at the CUNY Graduate Center under the directorship of the distinguished Puerto Rican scholar, Professor Frank Bonilla of Stanford, reduced the possible scope of advanced degree and research programs in Puerto Rican Studies at City College. Professor Aquino and I must accept responsibility for this last development because, in the early stages, the CUNY Graduate Center was not keen on monitoring the operation of this institute (established by the Ford Foundation) and we might have selfishly arranged for the transfer of the institute to City College; instead, Professor Aquino and I used our good offices to work out satisfactory arrangements between the Puerto Rican Research Institute and the CUNY Graduate Center. As far as the next decade is concerned, the Puerto Rican Studies Department may wish to give serious consideration to the enlargement of its mandate to cover a wider range of Hispanic studies, in consonance with the growing diversity of Hispanic students at City College.

§2b Asian Studies Department

Within the other three departments: Asian Studies, Black Studies and Jewish Studies, where there was no permanent chairman in place by September 1971, affairs were somewhat more turbulent and developments less straightforward during the 1971-72 academic year. And in a curious way, the opportunity for a fuller discussion of mission in each of these three ethnic studies department, occasioned by the search for a new chairman during the 1971-72 academic year, created the conditions for wider differences of opinion in later years.

The Asian Studies Department operated under Acting Chairman Varma, who made it clear at the outset that he was not a candidate for permanent chairman and whose efforts to fix the direction of the Asian Studies curriculum and recruit faculty were undermined by the very process of searching for his successor. In trying to identify a suitable permanent chairman, the Faculty-Student Search Committee quite properly wanted to know whether the chief direction of the Asian Studies Department would be in Area Studies or Asian-American studies, or some combination thereof. This questioning process generated its share of internal struggle and political polarization, evolving in typical Hegelian fashion: thesis, antithesis and, ultimately, synthesis. The "thesis" was strongly supported by the students, whose surge of pride and interest in their Chinese heritage and in their identity as Chinese-Americans created the desire for the Asian Studies Department in the first place. The militant leadership among them opted rather strongly for the Asian-American emphasis. The "antithesis" viewpoint was defended by the traditional faculty -

who were borrowed from other departments during this planning period - and who thought that the Asian Areas orientation would enable the Asian Ethnic Studies Department to quickly become a respected and rigorous academic discipline. Of course, the obvious "synthesis" would be a combination of Asian-American Ethnic Studies and Asian Area Studies.

As we well know, it sometimes takes considerable to and fro motion before the "synthesis" is arrived at. And so first, after much wrangling, meeting, and leafletting, the choice was made, by the early Spring of 1972, in favor of the Asian-America option. I was quite prepared to accept this decision of the Faculty-Student Steering and Planning Committee and to appoint a chairman who would fulfill this mandate. However, the students became impatient with the pace of the Search Committee's efforts to find a department chairman and a group of students, signing themselves "Concerned Asian Students", sent me a demand (one of several) for the appointment of Professor T. K. Tong (of the Columbia University Department of Library Science) as Chairman. They led up to their demand with an introductory statement which read as follows:

> "For the past two years, we Third World Students at City College have been actively and openly dealing with administrators and faculty for building an education; an education which deals with our needs and aspirations.
>
> We come from various backgrounds - from the slums of the lower East side to Central and Spanish Harlem, to the South Bronx. Many of our Third World peoples have allowed ourselves to be abused with racist thinking and stereotyping while not really bringing those factors to task; while allowing them to go unchallenged.
>
> Our peoples have suffered greatly at the hands of racism. We continue to suffer: in Africa, Indochina, in the south and north of this country the tool of racism is used to subordinate our integrity and humanity to Western values.

> Here at City College Third World students have fought for relevant faculty and courses within ethnic studies since the 1969 spring takeover of South Campus. We have attempted to work out curriculum which would analyze correctly the problems of our peoples within the larger society."

They then made their demand for Professor Tong's immediate appointment with the argument:

> "We have found in Prof. Tong the excellent academic scholarship, the experience in serving and studying Asian and Third World communities in America, the ability to work with students, faculty and administrators and above all the commitment and determination to forge a new excellence in higher education for all students."

Professor Tong was on the "short list" of candidates for the Chairmanship which the Search Committee had presented to me in early Spring of 1972 and I informed a delegation of "Concerned Asian Students" that I planned to interview the candidates within a very short timeframe and that a final decision would undoubtedly be made within several weeks. This reply was considered unsatisfactory and a group of 50-60 Asian students proceeded to occupy the building on the City College campus housing the Ethnic Studies Departments. As usual, it was a Thursday (the best day for demonstrations and takeovers since there were no classes from noon to 2 p.m. every Thursday to allow faculty to attend to their departmental meetings and students to involve themselves in extracurricular activities) and the time was towards the end of March 1972. I remember that day vividly because that evening I was the honored speaker at a banquet of the Newcomen Society, a black tie affair attended by several hundred business leaders with British connections. I was trying to engage the interest of this audience in the concept of a multi-ethnic university of the highest quality, knowing full well that before the evening was over

I would have to excuse myself to return to the campus (black tie and all) to cope with the Asian student takeover of a campus building. The Asian students vacated the building within a day or so when a court injunction was obtained and I granted amnesty to all students involved in this first occupation by Asian students. (I had a "rule-of-thumb" policy that had two essential ingredients: 1) all take-overs would be handled by the injunctive method and not by police action and 2) students of a given ethnic group would be amnestied after the first takeover but would be subjected to disciplinary charges thereafter.)

With the takeover disposed of, the ordinary procedures of the search process could be completed, and within a month, Professor Tong was, in fact, appointed Chairman of the Asian Studies Department. Professor Tong was a quiet, undemonstrative person, who instilled confidence in his integrity and in his devotion to the idea of developing a sound Asian-American curriculum with related Chinatown-based practicum projects. I helped him secure a $25,000 grant from the Field Foundation to establish a "viable City College-run community service program in Chinatown." The funds supported the beginning of a very strong program of community-oriented research and service projects. City College students set up the Asian-American Resource Center as part of the Basement Workshop, a Chinatown-based community organization. The Center became the focus for many students to initiate their research and community action projects. Among them, for instance, was the Asian-American Resource Library, a collection of materials of use to community advocacy planners as well as students, faculty and community researchers. Other projects at the Basement Workshop which involved students were a bilingual Community Handbook/Survival Guide, an oral history project of elderly Asian pioneering immigrants, an audio-visual program in Asian-American Studies for the public school system, and volunteer writing, graphics and photography for two Asian-American magazines, Bridge and Yellow Pearl.

Another major project undertaken by Asian Studies students and faculty was the Chinatown Day Care Center of City College which provided Asian-American students with the opportunity to develop academic, social and cultural awareness through sensitive, bilingual-bicultural educational experience with the very young. The Chinatown Day Care Center sticks in my memory as one of those projects fraught with conflict for no very good reason. In August, 1972, there was a meeting with Asian-American students in my office over the issue of proper pay for students working in the Chinatown Day Care Center. The students expressed dissatisfaction with the wages they were receiving out of the Field Foundation Grant (I got involved in this fracas because I had been foolish enough to take the initiative in securing the Field Grant in the first place!), and demanded the same wages as municipal workers with full-time jobs in day care centers operated by New York City. I was dumbfounded by the demand since I did not even know that the students were being paid out of the Field Grant for their services at the Chinatown Day Care Center - I had assumed from their deeply-expressed concern for the young children of Chinatown that they were volunteering their services - and it seemed unconscionable to use Field money to pay inexperienced undergraduates the same wages as certified day care center personnel. The meeting became acrimonious and, finally, one young Asian-American woman yelled 'shit!' in my face. My frustration-anger level soared to the point that it precipitated a stroke, right there and then during the meeting. As a result, I was temporarily 'out of commission' and spent the next two months recuperating. Such were the personal risks to which college presidents were subjected during the decade of the Seventies!

After one year, Professor Tong, who had originally been the students' choice for the chairmanship of the Asian Studies Department, asked to be relieved of these duties. Apparently, Professor Tong was no longer interested in serving as Chairman of a department where decisions were made, protests waged, and votes cast about departmental policy strictly along political lines. Professor Tong became quite disenchanted when he realized that certain members of the Faculty-Student Curriculum and Planning Committee was making positive recommendations about prospective professors and staff primarily on the basis of their acceptance of Mao Zedong thought. It was as if the Chinese war of national liberation was being refought by surrogates of the Kuomintang and the Chinese People's Liberation Army on this committee. After one year, the students' idol, Professor Tong, was saying that he was no longer willing to live with the frustrating, time-consuming and disruptive "mini - protracted people's war" to ensure the hiring of Maoist faculty and staff in the Asian Studies Department. And so I was soon appointing another Asian Studies Faculty-Student Search Committee, on which I tried to balance the various factions (whose political affiliations, I hasten to add, were not as transparent in the Spring of 1973 as they became later). The successful candidate was Professor Winberg Chai from California, a person who seemed genuinely interested in the academic quality of the Asian Studies Department rather than its correct political orientation.

Under Professor Chai's Chairmanship, the Asian Studies Department continued over the next several years to develop a reasonable balance between Asian Area Studies and Asian-American studies. The program in Chinese language and literature was soon transferred from the Classics Department to the Asian Studies Department in order to strengthen the latter department. Just as the Asian Studies Department seemed to be settling down to serious work in Area Studies, Asian Languages and Literature, and Asian-American Studies, a new confrontation took place between the more militant students and the Chairman. Apparently, during the early months of Professor Tong's tenure as Chairman, several young instructors were appointed by the Executive Committee of the Department at the urging of the students. These instructors were without Ph.D.'s (but supposedly working for them) and concentrated on developing courses in the Asian-American part of the curriculum. By the second year of Chai's Chairmanship, reappointments of the two instructors were turned down almost unanimously by the Executive Committee (which had five faculty members and two students) and a new explosion took place. Chai stated that the two instructors were "ill-qualified" and that their approach to teaching Asian-American Studies was a "disgrace"; furthermore, Chai claimed that their approach "was not systematic and lacked direction, and that they personally never established any official rapport with the Chinatown community". The instructors maintained that Chai's real objections "lay with the political tone of their courses, which emphasized ethnic heritage and the historical oppression and discrimination of the Asian minority in America". Not unexpectedly, a group of students came to the defense of the two instructors and, forming themselves into the "Ad Hoc Committee to Defend Asian Studies", demanded the immediate rehiring of the two instructors and the immediate dismissal of Professor Chai as Chairman of the Asian Studies Department.

Soon, the Ad Hoc Committee was asking for frequent meetings with me to argue their case, and exchanging letters (one of the facts of life at City College - at least during the Seventies - was that the president was expected, by students and faculty alike, to be involved in all controversies, no matter how trivial) - all this during the Spring of 1975. They were telling me that:

> "Asian Studies, brought about by student concern and action, was nurtured through the work of students along with concerned faculty members. It was through the dedication and cooperation between faculty and students that Asian Studies courses were passed and the department began to function. It is just this dedication and cooperation which Chairman Chai is destroying, in his effort to change the progressive content and direction of our courses and programs!"

I was telling them that the Asian Studies Department was created:

> "not as a result of their struggles, but because of the College's conviction that Asian students needed and could benefit from this department."

and that I had reluctantly come to the conclusion that the Asian Studies Department:

> "was struggling for its survival because a small group of students,

236

those who led the Ad Hoc Committee to Defend Asian Studies, would only accept an Asian Studies Department built along the lines of their own brand of political and social orientation.".

The Ad Hoc Committee responded by acknowledging that "President Marshak helped in the formation and approval of a separate Department of Asian Studies" but insisted that:

> "All Third World students must understand that whatever we fight for, whatever concessions the ruling class and Administration is forced to give to us will always be under fire. Open Admissions and Third World Studies are such concessions made by such a ruling class and historically since their inception have been struggling for survival."

With that, a group of students led by the Ad Hoc Committee occupied the Administration Building and, again, an injunction had to be used to evict them. This time, however, charges were filed with the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee who found the leader of the takeover guilty of violating the BHE's "rules and regulations for the maintenance of public order", and suspended him for one semester.

Professor Chai was now in firm control of the Asian Studies Department and worked hard to give it national recognition. With a second grant in 1976 from the Field Foundation, the Asian Studies Department was able to organize in 1977 the Asian-American Assembly for Policy Research, an organization dedicated to finding solutions to major problems confronting Asian-Americans and providing a national forum for research into and dialog about Asian-American concerns as well as U.S.-Asia relations. The Assembly sponsored seminars, workshops and regional conferences which brought together a variety of academic specialists, Asian-American business people and community leaders to discuss such issues as bicultural education

237

of Chinese-Americans, social services and U.S. immigration policies affecting Asians, problems of Chinese immigrant youth and U.S. foreign relations with China, Japan and other Asian nations. The Asian-American Assembly for Policy Research did bring national visibility to the City College Asian Studies Department, so much so that by the Summer of 1978 Professor Chai was lured away to a vice presidency in a midwestern university. It is difficult to predict the future of the Asian Studies Department at City College except to note that the recent warming up of Chinese-American relations has brought a substantial number of students and scholars to the City College campus in a variety of disciplines and this provides intellectual resources upon which the Asian Studies Department could build.

In order to understand the dynamics of some of the events taking place in connection with ethnic studies at City College during my presidency, I should say a few words about the use of the phrases "Third World" and "Third World Peoples". From the record, it seems clear that the South Campus Occupation in 1969 was carried out by a group of Black and Puerto Rican students and did not include any Asian students (some Asian students may have joined with the "new left" White students in support of the occupation but the fact is that the Black and Puerto Rican Studies rejected help from this group.). The Five Demands did not contain any reference to Asian-American problems and interests. The Cartey document, in proposing a "School of Regional and Community Affairs", stated explicitly that by "Regional", he meant "all those areas of the world inhabited and influenced by peoples of African descent...". A liberal interpretation of the Cartey memorandum would include the Puerto Rican community - because of the broad use of the term Caribbean peoples - and it was so interpreted. But despite the fact that the number of Asian students exceeded the number of Puerto Rican students at City College in 1969, the Asian group was not included in the action and thinking at that time. This is not being said by way of criticism but merely to throw light on later developments during the Seventies.

When I arrived at City College in 1970, my first-hand experience had not been with the ethnic heritage and cultural identity problems within the United States but rather with the frightening economic gap between the developing and developed nations of the world and the role that science and technology might play in overcoming this gap between the Third World (of Africa, Asia and South America) and the West. Consequently, when I encouraged the inclusion of the Asian Studies Department among the four Ethnic Studies Departments established by the College of Liberal Arts and Science in the Spring of 1971, I did state in all sincerity that I hoped the evolution of the Asian Studies, Black Studies and Puerto Rican Studies Departments would lead, after a number of years, to the creation of a unique and flourishing School of Third World Studies at City College, of which these three departments would be integral parts. As we have seen, the terms "Third World" and "Third World Peoples" are sometimes used for polemical purposes and, as we shall see in Chapter 6, the acceptance or rejection of the HEW guidelines (which treat the Asian, Black and Hispanic groups on a symmetrical footing) sometimes depends on whose interest is being served. As far as I am concerned, I have tried to adhere to a consistent position throughout the nine years of my presidency, namely that Asians, Blacks and Hispanics in the United States all fall within the official HEW guidelines and that these three groups mirror the major regions of the impoverished Third World. With these definitions clearly in mind, it is fairly straightforward to delineate the urban and global missions of an institution of higher education whose student body has a substantial representation from each of these three groups (as well as White ethnics).

§2c Black Studies Department

The success of the Black Studies Department at City College is the key to the future of ethnic studies at this institution. With a student body which is one-third Black, one-third Asian and Hispanic (about 10% Asian, 15% Puerto Rican and the remainder Hispanic non-Puerto Rican) and one-third White (of which about a quarter, in turn, is Jewish), it is only natural that the Black Studies Department is by far the largest (both in terms of number of faculty and student registration). But there are other cogent reasons why the Black Studies Department has the leadership role thrust upon it: historical, ethnic studies as a liberal arts discipline, and community outreach. The first reason is historical; it was really the Black Civil Rights Movement during the Sixties and Black leadership of the South Campus occupation that set the terms of reference and defined the claims of the "new ethnicity" at City College. The persistence of the economic and social disadvantagement of the Black community in the United States into the Eighties and beyond portends, since the same situation was responsible for the creation of this department in the first place, that it will fight for its survival and continued growth. Secondly, ethnic studies is a liberal arts discipline (where, as in Chapter 4, the term "liberal arts" means a combination of the humanities and social science; it is interesting to recall that at City College, the Black Studies and Puerto Rican Studies Departments are in the Social Science Division and the Asian Studies and Jewish Studies Departments are in the Humanities Division) and it is more likely that Black and Puerto Rican students, with their majors primarily in liberal arts, education or nursing, will register for an ethnic studies course than the Asian and Jewish students, with their majors primarily in science, engineering or architecture. This tends to increase the dominance of the Black Studies Department among the four Ethnic Studies Departments. Finally, the presence of City College in the Harlem community offers more opportunities for the Black Studies Department to develop readily accessible practicum projects in connection with its courses. Thus, the Black Studies Department is in a unique position at City College to realize its full potential over a wide spectrum of functions.

As I have explained, the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies (UES) under the chairmanship of Osborne Scott was Acting President Copeland's response to the Cartey proposal for a "School of Regional and

Community Affairs". UES was, in effect, operating as a Black Studies Department and very quickly there was a proliferation of courses in Afro-American Studies, Caribbean Studies, and to a lesser extent, African Studies. Professor Scott was a fine teacher and a person of enormous good will (he had been an Army chaplain) but with no previous history of Black scholarship, it was difficult for him as UES Chairman to insist on placing these courses within a coherent curriculum. With the abolition of UES and the resignation of Scott, the new Black Studies Department was ready to embark on new directions under new leadership. As in the case of two of the other newly-created Ethnic Studies Departments (Asian and Jewish), the time was too short to identify a permanent chairman for the academic year 1971-72 and it was necessary to look for temporary leadership.

In occurred to me that the distinguished Black scholar in political science, Charles Hamilton, who had been one of the outside reviewers for UES during the previous year and was located at nearby Columbia University, might be willing to become Acting Chairman and to get the Black Studies Department off to a fast start. Since it was difficult to consult the Search Committee per se (it was the Summer of 1971 and the Committee was dispersed), I consulted several Black faculty members from other departments (all of whom had demonstrated an interest in the Black Studies Department and some of whom taught courses in the department) and received widespread support for the idea. I therefore approached Professor Hamilton with the proposition and he was persuaded to give it a try. I was delighted and, when he plunged into his new job with great determination in September 1971, I promised him the utmost cooperation from the President's Office. He told the students and faculty involved with the Black Studies Department that:

> "my major interest is a sound academic curriculum on a sound financial footing...Black Studies should be of sound imagination and implementation, not a political game..."

True to his statement, Hamilton pushed for the development of a two-semester core course entitled "Afro-American Heritage" in the Black Studies Curriculum, for the introduction of the concepts and tools (statistics, methodology, etc.) from other disciplines into the curriculum, and for the initial design of curricula that would serve to prepare students for one of the following: 1) subsequent study in professional schools; 2) subsequent study in graduate departments of Black Studies and/or established disciplines; or 3) employment in various types of community organizations after graduation without the necessity of proceeding immediately to further post-baccalaureate study. Hamilton was willing to halt the proliferation of new courses and dedicate departmental energies (both faculty and student) to the design of well-defined and tractable curricula.

Hamilton's views found disfavor with many of the students and some of the faculty. The student activists believed that the Black Studies Department should become the instrument for the immediate improvement of the Black condition both domestically and worldwide, and registered impatience with Professor Hamilton's deliberate approach. Several faculty members of the Black Studies Department, apparently strongly influenced by Cartey's ideas, prepared a document entitled "Statement of Purpose-Black Studies Department" in November 1971 from which I quote several representative passages:

> "Black Studies symbolizes, in historical terms, the efforts of the colonized African-American for representation within the hegemonic academic institutions as well as the efforts of the colonial European-American to respond to the decolonization demands of the Africa-American through the adaptation of the basically colonial academic institutions. The European-American represented by the academic administrator, therefore, envisages an area studies career for Black Studies...Thus, even though political exigencies make it necessary for the African-American to be placated in terms of the tacit agreement that Black staff teach and develop those areas, the academic authority of this new discipline is grounded in the established tradition of the university...By Black education we mean a process which places certain functional skills and tools in the hands of the student for the struggle of the African people. The purpose of this education, in the form of Black Studies, is to provide theoretical and practical tools for the progressive development of the total African Community...the idea is to develop and extend theories and applications that relate to the total Black community, and not simply the college community. Self-determination is a motivating force in the African community today...Black Studies represents the effort in thought to make apparent the reason of colonialism and hence its limit; its purpose is to cultivate the intelligence of the Black man so that his political efforts may reflect wisdom...
>
> Black Studies is not like any other department, for its function is not only technically different (which accounts for the differences within the established disciplines), but also ethically different. Existing departments are the academic minds of European Studies, which constitutes the university. Black Studies is the mind which is to reflect upon the quality of the European academic minds as they limit the minds of all, European and Black, in the full understanding of the facts of their common experience, and also to undo immediately the effects of that limitation upon the minds of all, European and Black, in the full understanding of the facts of their common experience, and also to undo immediately the effects of that limitation upon the minds of Blacks politically victimized by these colonial intellects...
>
> Courses in the basic assumptions of economics, political science, anthropology, psychology, music, etc., are needed in order that the students may be better able to make the connections, for example, between economics and Black Studies, and to discriminate between the truths and prejudicies of the disciplines. In the same vein courses are needed in the political sociology and political economy of the colonial society in order that the students may be able to function efficiently and effecitvely not only in maximizing their immediate professional goals but also in establishing organizational stopping points in the route to civilization decolonization..."

It was soon evident that the Black Studies Department was in a confrontational mode: between Chairman Hamilton, the student activists, and certain key members of the faculty. By December 1971, Professor Hamilton, who had accepted the Acting Chairmanship as a labor of love, had no taste for confrontation and resigned immediately. I prevailed upon him to reconsider his resignation and undertook some personal mediation efforts; when these produced no progress, Hamilton resigned a second time as of February 1, 1972. Professor Moyibi Amoda was appointed Acting Chairman for the Spring semester of 1972; Professor Amoda was a summa cum laude from Dartmouth, a Ph.D. from Berkeley and a young and promising Black scholar who had joined UES the year before. Under the circumstances then prevailing in the Black Studies Department, Professor Amoda had no choice but to accelerate the pace of academic development with new and revised courses in the three principal concentration areas within the department: Afro-American, Caribbean and African. Late that semester, the Search Committee recruited a new chairman from San Jose State College in California where he was the highly regarded Chairman of the Black Studies Department; Professor Jeffries was a Columbia Ph.D., a former Political Science instructor at City College and a person with scholarly attainments as well as administrative achievements. When Professor Jeffries arrived on the campus in September 1972, he lost no time in making it clear that he was not a Hamilton protegé; in an interview with a reporter from the Black and Puerto Rican student newspaper, The Paper , he stated:

> "Black Studies has to be made a component to the Black community because Black people need to know what plans the city has for Harlem... We need to rewrite, re-analyze and produce materials relating to the Black World. We need Third World materials created for and by Third World people for all public institutions...We should produce materials on Neo-colonialism in the Caribbean and America, defining our positions and resolutions...It is definitely that time in history for Black people to exert their expertise and knowledge in establishing positive directions for economic and political liberation. Too long have we been satisfied with half of the pie and mickey mouse programs..."

Professor Jeffries soon found that his aspirations for the Black Studies Department had to be tempered by certain basic realities. His colorful language created a sense of self-esteem among Blacks but was provocative to non-Blacks. It also gave rise to unattainable expectations. After a while, Professor Jeffries realized that his strongest supporters - the student activist leaders, some of whom had been given part-time appointments in the department - and certain junior faculty could not convert his ambitious plans into actual performance (e.g. produce the Third World materials he had promised). He also discovered that some of the strong separatist statements emanating from the Black Studies Department did not sit well with the other two "Third World" Ethnic Studies Departments (Asian Studies and Puerto Rican Studies) and when the trial period of three years was over and the time came to reach a decision as to whether a School for Third World Studies should be established - a recommendation to which I had pledged serious consideration - the Asian and Puerto Rican Studies Departments declined to join the Black Studies Deparment in a single School of Third World Studies. This happened around 1974 or 1975 and must have come as quite a shock to the Black Studies Department. At that point, the Black Studies Department argued for its own transformation into a School for Black Studies but this had no defensible rationale as far as I was concerned and had to be rejected. Each of the four Ethnic Studies Departments was then given the choice of the Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Science in which it wished to be included and, as I have already stated, the Black Studies and Puerto Rican Studies Departments chose the Social Science Division and the Asian Studies and Jewish Studies Departments the Humanities Division.

My view is that the repudiation by the two other "Third World" Ethnic Studies Departments persuaded the Black Studies Department to rethink its tactics and, possibly, even some of its goals. Cooperative ventures with other departments became a more common occurrence, offers of assistance from colleagues in other disciplines were accepted with increasing frequency, and the conviction that White folks could not really be interested in the problems of Black folks began to lose force. I should like to describe in some detail a very positive development during the last two and one-half years of my presidency, wherein the Black Studies Department took the leadership in a project involving the entire College - the Nigerian Workshop - and which, in my opinion, holds forth great promise for the future. Professor Jeffries was deeply involved in this project as was his colleague in the Black Studies Department, Professor Amoda.

The story of the "Nigerian Connection" began in 1972 in the Paris offices of UNESCO where the idea was born for the U.N. Development Program (UNDP) to finance bilateral links between institutions in the developed and developing countries. The administrator for that year of the new UNDP program on Technological Education and Research, headquartered in Paris, was Professor Harry Lustig, a physicist on leave from City College. With that position and the guidelines of the job, Professor Lustig saw a chance to modify what for him had been a long-standing problem in the way aid programs were organized between the developed and developing nations; he wrote:

> "I have long been struck by one drawback in all the bilaterial links projects that I am aware of, namely the lack of symmetry in the contribution of the institutions in the developed and developing countries. It is usually the developed universities which send the professors and the equipment and the developing universities which send the students and fellows. This donor-recipient relationship is, in my opinion, not the best for either institution or for the promotion of international cooperation. However, it seems to be inevitable, as long as the link is confined to one discipline, particularly if it is one of the sciences.
>
> But what if two fields were involved, one a science or field of engineering in which the university in the developed country is the stronger and the other, a cultural field in which the developing university has something to offer...Could UNESCO, with UNDP assistance therefore not forge a link involving at least two departments (or faculties) in a Western and an African University, one being a science or technology department, the other being a department in the field of African studies? Mr. de Hemptinne, the originator of the idea of UNDP - sponsored institutional links, thinks that this would not be impossible under the terms of the UNDP decision, although it might perhaps be necessary to find other funds to finance the part of the programme which would benefit the developed university."*

---

*Letter of H. Lustig, Director, Division of Technological Education and Research, UNESCO, Paris, to Chief Olu Ibukun, Head, Field Office for Africa, Nairobi, Kenya, 22 March 1972.

Professor Lustig then wrote to me in general terms about the idea of a bilateral link between the City College Physics and Black Studies Departments and the equivalent departments in an African university. I encouraged him to explore the possibilities. The person on the African side of the as-yet-unofficial project, who was also committed to the 'bi-directionality of transfer' and willing to help implement the idea was Chief Olu Ibukun, the Nigerian Head of UNESCO's Field Service Office for Africa. Chief Ibukun, a scientist, became enthusiastic about multi-disciplinary and symmetrical links between countries but was concerned about the apparent limit to links between some institution (not necessarily an university) in a developing country and one or more institutions in a developed country. He felt that the links should be made between equal (advanced educational) institutions involving the exchange of African scientists, not just social scientists, and that there should be inter-African links as well.

Many African universities were proposed for the project but were ultimately rejected as not appropriate, largely due to their existing links with European universities. In the end, the University of Ife in Nigeria was chosen as a sympathetic and appropriate institution for several reasons. It was relatively new, without existing foreign links, the administration wanted 'technological transfer' and was willing to experiment, and the Vice-Chancellor was American-educated and interested in an American link.

The working proposal drawn up by Professor Lustig was for a project that would run five years. Each year the African university--

Ife--would send two professors in African studies and ten students in the field of science and technology to the developed university--City College. City College, in turn, would send two professors in science or technology and ten students in Black Studies to Ife. The African university would receive scientific equipment for participation in the research program of the developed university. The developed university would receive library and audio-visual materials in African studies.

In the Spring of 1973, a CCNY-UNDP delegation was invited to Ife to meet with the Vice-Chancellor. Dean Lustig (Professor Lustig had become dean of the Science Division by that time) and Chairman Jeffries of the Black Studies Department were the representatives from City College. During the discussions, it became obvious that Ife had a very clear sense of its needs and the areas in which it sought immediate assistance from developed universities abroad. The most important resource needed for supporting research and teaching in the sciences and technological education was a workshop facility for installation and maintenance of scientific equipment. The logistical problems entailed in building up the capacity for research and teaching in the sciences made such a facility a fundamental prerequisite for further growth. Within that context, Ife saw its immediate needs not in collaboration in scientific research but in institutional development through the establishment of a Department of Civil Engineering. Interest in science qua science had a lower priority than these two areas of concern. A committee on the humanities and social sciences also discussed the "software" of the linkage activities. It became clear that the content of the proposals brought from Paris had to be greatly modified in terms of Ife's development needs.

The integrity of the linkage idea was, however, unimpaired. The problem as it unfolded was whether Ife's newly-defined needs in engineering could be met by City College and whether both had allotted sufficient importance to the social science and humanities component of the exchange. As negotiations became drawn out at City College, it became obvious to Ife and UNDP officials that the 'package' had to be broken down into its components. Ife then turned to Great Britain for its engineering curriculum need. Professor Issac Akinjogbin came to City College for a year as Buell Gallagher Visiting Professor in the Departments of History and Black Studies. During his visit to CCNY, Professor Akinjogbin in effect became Ife's liaison in the negotiations and with Professor Jeffries, they pursued the humanistic aspect of the proposal. Unfortunately, in informal discussions held with representatives of the Ford Foundation, it turned out that Ford was only interested in funding an international conference on Yoruba Civilization which was held in 1974 in Ife.

The oncoming financial crisis in New York in 1975 in effect terminated the idea of the UNDP program at City College, and meant that Ife would implement the scientific and engineering aspects of that program with a British counterpart. This was the state of affairs from 1975 to December 1976. Yet, as a result of the personal relationship between Professor Akinjogbin and Professor Jeffries, Chairman of the Black Studies Department, who had come to symbolize the Ife-CCNY link, the idea of a sustained relationship between the two institutions actually widened to include the idea of nation-building linkages between Nigeria and the U.S. At the same time, a separate set of dynamics was set in motion through activities centered on the renovation of Africa House, a student facility at the edge of City College. Africa House, a handsome brownstone on 140th Street, had been established in the Forties by a group of students studying at Columbia University, including Chief K. O. Mbadiwe (a Nigerian and now the official liaison between the President of Nigeria and the Nigerian Congress), Kwame Nkrumah (the late President of Ghana) and others, with the assistance of Eleanor Roosevelt and Mary Bethune. Africa House had served for many decades as a meeting place and hostel for African students in New York and had been taken over by the Nigerian-based African Academy of Arts and Research under the honorary chairmanship of Chief Mbadiwe. The local branch of the Academy (the main branch is in Lagos) had come under the leadership of Osborne Scott who had become concerned about the deteriorating condition of Africa House, as had Chief Mbadiwe.

About 1975, Scott brought Mbadiwe to my office, who quietly inquired whether City College could share in some way in the renovation of Africa House. The request was very timely, coming shortly after I had decided to expend some of the income of the Jacob R. Schiff Fund (a million dollar bequest which had been given to City College to enrich the cultural life of its students) to help renovate several brownstones close to the campus that were serving City College students (e.g. Hillel House, Newman House, etc.); one of the conditions that I attached to these grants - in order to emphasize the College's multi-ethnic and religiously ecumenical posture - was that "open houses" would be held on a regular basis by the recipient organizations for all City College students. Be that as it may, Chief Mbadiwe's request met with an immediate affirmative response from me with the only proviso that Africa House would have to organize its activities in such a way that Black students from City College would benefit from the College's sharing in the cost of renovation. Chief Mbadiwe welcomed this condition and the agreement was sealed.

As the relationship between Chief Mbadiwe and myself became increasingly cordial - he would stop by for a visit during his occasional trips to the United States - he invited me in November 1976 to be his guest in Lagos on the occasion of the Festival of Arts and Culture (FESTAC) held every five years in Africa (in Lagos in January 1977). I could accept his invitation and stop for a couple of days in Nigeria on a return trip from India (where I would be spending two weeks as the guest of the University Grants Commission there). This invitation provided the opportunity for the Black Studies Department to formulate its ideas on linkages between Nigeria and America, the two countries with the largest Black populations in the world. The Black Studies faculty thought in terms of building links around the idea of "nation building" in both Africa and America - for the process of nation building in the U.S. was still seen as incomplete for the Black community.

Black Americans have yet to achieve full and equal access on all levels of American national life. The Black Studies faculty, itself representing a microcosm of the Black World with personnel from the U.S., the Caribbean, and Africa, argued that Harlem, as America's Black metropolis, would need the coordination of Black World resources for its development as a viable community in the same way that other Black communities or status needed the assistance of their kin in both the new world (U.S./Caribbean) and the old (Africa). (This is one of the driving ideas for the International Trade Center for the Third World which is being planned for 125th Street - see Chapter 7.)

Moreover, one of the accepted purposes of Black ethnic studies at City College was the development of knowledge requisite for Black world development, yet knowledge related to the conditions and special perspectives of Blacks in America. It seemed reasonable that an American-Nigerian linkage - which went beyond the earlier City College-Ife linkage - might further this objective. Hence, during our visit to Nigeria in January 1977, I joined with Professors Jeffries and Amoda in exploring mechanisms for such a broader linkage. With the assistance of Chief Mbadiwe, an agenda was put together which involved a meeting with the then Federal Commissioner of Education (Nigeria), Colonel Amidu Ali. At this meeting, the possibility of initiating a Nigerian-U.S. Workshop process on technology transfer was discussed. At a subsequent meeting in the U.S. between Commissioner Ali and City College representatives, it was agreed that the Workshop was neither going to be a mere exercise in academic analysis for the aggrandizement of scholars' credentials nor a technology supermarket for the promotion of the latest gadgets. Commissioner Ali assured our group that he would take up the Workshop concept with his Ministry and appropriate members of his government.

Commissioner Ali in due course instructed Dr. Jibril Aminu, Executive Director of the Nigerian National Universities Commission (NUC) to organize the Workshop with City College. With the NUC as the Nigerian coordinating agency also came the involvement of the Nigerian Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA) as the agency with resources earmarked for enlarging Nigeria's science and technology programs. On the American side, we brought in as the counterpart of NSTDA, the National Academy of Sciences through its Board on Science and Technology for International Development (NAS/BOSTID) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID). Approximately eighteen months elapsed between the time in November 1977, when Dr. Aminu informed me that he had been given responsibility on the Nigerian side for the organization of the Workshop, until April 1979 when the week-long Workshop was actually held at City College under the title "Technological Development in Nigeria". The NUC, the coordinating agency for the thirteen Nigerian universities, had accepted the task of helping to produce the indigenous managerial and technical personnel required to so direct the nation's emergent wealth and long-term development that the basic human needs of all sectors of Nigerian society would be met. For the NUC, the Nigerian-United States Workshop became a vehicle for U.S. input into the formulation of a master plan for the rapid technological and economic development of their country.

To try to fulfill these Nigerian expectations, we organized a National Advisory Committee (NAC) on the American side of about 25-30 members, under the Chairmanship of Professor Roger Revelle, who worked closely with BOSTID and was a consultant to many of the developing countries. The dominant representation on the NAC came from the scientific-academic community with relevant experience for this Nigerian-American Workshop, but with representation also from industry, foundations and government. At the suggestion of the Black Studies Department, the National Advisory Committee had a strong representation from the Black intellectual community so that the "Nigerian Connection" could later become the source of academic innovation and career opportunities for students at Black colleges and universities in the United States. I shall not go into the organizational details - with planning meetings held in Washington, New York and Lagos - except to note that Professor Amoda of the Black Studies Department acted as an important liaison between the American and Nigerian sides through several trips to Nigeria, firming up the final agenda and topics covered in the delivered papers from both sides. I should also mention that the local City College Organizing Committee, consisting of representatives from the Black Studies Department, Science and Engineering departments, and a variety of other interested departments, met on a weekly basis for several months before the Workshop, to implement the decisions of the Nigerian NUC and the American NAC and to ensure full American coverage of the topics in which the Nigerians had expressed interest. The local organizing group worked harmoniously and effectively together and was, I believe, pioneering in the degree of intellectual cooperation established between an ethnic studies department and the traditional liberal arts and professional departments at the College.

The Workshop itself took place April 9-13, 1979 and the delegation of about 25 Nigerian representatives (from all thirteen universities, private industry and government) under the leadership of Dr. Aminu, was matched by a group of American participants two to three times that number. The Workshop was organized under three major themes, with each theme divided into sub-topics. The first major theme was "Basic Concepts and Tools for Technology Acquisition". Under this theme were grouped such topics as: "Models for Technology Transfer Between Nigeria and the United States", "Relevant Technology and Technology Choices", "Legal Aspects of Technology Transfer", "Development of Technological Awareness", and others. The second major theme was "Science, Technology and Management Education" and, under its rubric came such topics as "Orientation and Curriculum of Technological Education in Nigeria", "Integration of Formal and Non-Formal Technological and Technical Education", "Role of Non-University Tertiary Institutions in Science, Technology and Management Training", "Role of Private Sector in Research Training", and several others. The final major theme was "Development of Resources", and it covered such topics as "Design and Production of Machinery and Equipment", "Management and Optimal Utilization of Resources', "Agro-Industiral Technology Transfer", "Building Technology", and several others.

It should also be noted that at the official banquet of the Workshop, attended by many Nigerian and American dignitaries, policy statements were communicated by two top government officials involved in the special bilateral relationship between Nigeria and the United States: Dr. Frank Press, Science Advisor to President Carter, and Dr. G. B. Leton, the Nigerian Commissioner of Education. Both countries pledged continued cooperation in the application of education and technology to Nigerian development.

The Workshop was a great success and the 850 pages (single-spaced!) of published Proceedings were testimony to the thoughtful concern and seriousness of purpose with which the participants dealt with a complex agenda. Major innovative features of the Workshop were the conscious generation of action recommendations at each of the parallel sessions for consideration at the final plenary session of the Workshop, which recommendations were then transmitted to the highest levels of the two governments for consideration at their Bilateral Summit Meeting the following month (May 1979). It was generally agreed that if Nigeria is to receive appropriate technology, the nation must be in a position to absorb, assimilate, acquire and diffuse the transferred technology within her economy on a self-sustaining basis. It was also agreed that the United States can be of assistance in helping to identify the obstacles to the absorption and acquisition of technologies being transferred to Nigeria.

I believe that the spirit of the Nigerian-U.S. Workshop on the "Technological Development of Nigeria", was best captured by

Dr. Jibril Aminu, Executive Director of the NUC, in his opening address to the Workshop, from which I quote:

> "...Indeed, technological development must not only go hand in hand with the general upliftment of the lot of the people, it must derive its spirit and sense of direction from the very society it seeks to improve. Since the most important asset of a nation is the total human resource, technology, which can be simply defined as a product of human resourcefulness, is only meaningful if it is seen to identify completely with the people--their total circumstances on earth, their values, set social aspirations, priorities and the material resources at their disposal.
>
> Defining technology in terms of human resourcefulness puts the former in a clear and manageable perspective. The massive expansion of education at all levels in a country like Nigeria, will no doubt be accompanied by economic, social and political problems. The nation will be faced with what one authority refers to as the dilemma of popular education: political development versus political decay. The dilemma is not only one of frustrated social expectation but also the preservation of essence, of values and of the very souls of the people. Since education is the vehicle to technological acquisition, education should lead to technological development principally by stimulating resourcefulness, if it can be tamed, directed and rendered manageable...
>
> In achieving this type of technological development, everyone in a country has a role to play--the government, the private sector, the educational institutions and the individuals. The universities have, however, a prime role, being the keystone of the additional institutions...
>
> In this dialogue on technological development, therefore, considerable leadership must come from the universities, whatever may be the enabling roles of other parties, including governments. The universities are able to bring together divergent interest groups to a neutral platform for a dispassionate consideration and critical appraisal of issues..."

Dr. Aminu's message fell on sympathetic ears at City College. As I said earlier, one of the additional reasons to develop viable programs in ethnic studies at the College, leading in time to a School of Third World Studies, was the fact that the large Black, Hispanic and Asian student populations at the College mirrored the major developing regions of the world (Africa, Latin America, Asia) and thereby suggested a linkage between ethnic studies and the study of socio-economic, political and technological problems of developing nations. Furthermore, since New York is the home of the United Nations and other international agencies and many U.N. problems deal with the "Third World" and the strivings of "Third World peoples", the introduction of an international component into the College's ethnic studies programs would create for them a much broader context and perspective. It could also open up international career opportunities or jobs in developing countries for City College students. Expanding the City College-Ife link in this fashion would not simply be another 'study abroad' program; the various ethnic studies departments had already developed summer or semester-long study programs in Puerto Rico, Guyana, Tanzania and other countries. The link with the University of Ife was a strategy more in line with the "globalization" of the Urban Educational Model. From my perspective, the culmination of the City College-Ife link in the City College-NUC Workshop on "Technological Development in Nigeria" was an important step in international cooperation and problem-solving and the City College Black Studies Department - with Professors Amoda and Jeffries showing the way - demonstrated the great potential of this ethnic studies department for a leadership role in Third World development.

§2d Jewish Studies Department

Like the Asian Studies and Black Studies Departments, the Jewish Studies Department was delayed in finding its direction during the first year of its existence (beginning in September 1971) because of the failure to identify a permanent chairman by the time it commenced operation. (I have already stated that an excellent Acting Chairman, Eugene Borowitz, was appointed for the 1971-72 academic year.) As with the two other ethnic studies departments seeking permanent chairmen during the 1971-72 academic year, there were numerous difficulties and personality conflicts that had to be dealt with before the department could really begin to function effectively. The controversy that raged over the soul of the Jewish Studies Department during its first year could be characterized as a battle between academic "traditionalists" and academic "progressives" (there was no necessary correlation with whether one was "reformed", "conservative", or "orthodox" in the religious sense). The academic traditionalists were led by Professor Howard Adelson (the same person who was the most outspoken member of the small faculty group that fought against Open Admissions both before and after it was established - see the section on "Open Warfare" in Chapter 3) and Professor Marnin Feinstein (Classical Languages and Hebrew). This group prepared a proposal for the Faculty Council of the College of Liberal Arts and Science during the Spring of 1970 which stated as the two objectives of Jewish Studies at City College (this was all within the framework of an interdepartmental program - the concept of a separate Jewish Studies Department had not as yet gained currency):

> "1) To enable students to major in Jewish Studies on an undergraduate level and equip them for graduate study in this area through the doctoral level; 2) To work towards the establishment of a graduate department of Jewish Studies leading to the Ph.D. at City University."

This proposal also advanced the argument that only students demonstrating proficiency in the Hebrew language above a certain level should be permitted to major in Jewish Studies.

When I invited the distinguished Jewish scholar, Professor Emeritus Salo Baron of Columbia University, to head up an Advisory Committee on Jewish Studies during the first year of my presidency (mentioned earlier), I received a set of recommendations which moved the proposed Jewish Studies Program into "middle ground". The Baron Committee recommended two separate tracks: 1) a Jewish Studies major, and 2) a Jewish Social Studies major. The Baron Committee report went on:

> "For the latter there would be no Hebrew language requirements. The former would be a major that would enable students to do graduate work in Jewish studies. The latter would equip him for Jewish social service and Jewish living generally."

While the Baron Committee was carrying on its deliberations, I received communications from a number of Jewish faculty members at City College; I quote from one of these communications entitled "New Morning for American Jews: a Prolegomenon to Jewish Studies", signed by two "academic progressives":

> "For at least a generation, the structure of Jewish life in America has been rigidly, deadeningly dualistic. At one pole, the organizations and officials of Judaism--religious, charitable, intellectual, cultural, political. At another pole, a world away, the real life and energy of American Jews. The various establishments of Judaism disagree avidly about virtually everything; but they are united in their narrowness, their provinciality, their spiritual emptiness, their insensitivity to all the most urgent human issues, to all the deepest human needs. Hence, the most serious and creative American Jews -- in literature, philosophy, music, art, science, politics--have gravitated to an opposite pole: for all the differences and conflicts among them, they have all cut themselves off, not only from official Judaism, but from all

> of American Jewish life, and even from the Jewishness within themselves...In the last few years, under the psychic and political pressures of the 1960's, this destructive dualism has begun to break down. The brightest and most spirited Jews of the younger generation are refusing to lead a double life. They are seeking to build bridges between the Jewish past they have forgotten or repressed-or maybe never learned at all--and the humanistic ideals that animate them in the present, ideals that challenge them and move them to create a better future...Young American Jews are going through a great awakening today. They find themselves at a crucial historical moment, confronted with a tremendous opportunity, one they have never had before, and may never have again: the chance to affirm themselves as Jews _and_ as Americans _and_ as human beings; to belong to the past as well as the present and the future; to live one unified, integrated, honest life. A department of Jewish studies can be of enormous help in this awakening, in this ongoing work of unification. But the potential of such a department will be destroyed if it is controlled by the very establishment that created the dualism in the first place..."

The lines were drawn and, again, I had the unenviable task of trying to select a permanent chairman in an emotionally charged atmosphere of pressures and counter-pressures. Fortunately, there was a general procedure to deal with selection of chairmen of newly-created departments (as well as non-elective administrative positions) and that was to set up a faculty-student search committee in consultation with faculty and students and to ask for a roster of three to five names, from which the president would select one (I followed this procedure conscientiously except in the very rare circumstance where the committee's recommendation was unanimous and there genuinely did not seem to be any other available candidates). The first faculty-student search committee for a chairman of the Jewish Studies Department, in a split vote, sent me only one name, that of Professor Feinstein, without making any serious effort to search for outside candidates as well. Professor Feinstein was a teacher of Hebrew and had the traditional aspirations for the Jewish Studies department at City College. The Student Jewish Collective - aided and abetted by several of the "academic traditionalists" among the faculty - threatened me with all kinds of dire consequences if I did not appoint Professor Feinstein but I insisted on a full-fledged search. My stubbornness was rewarded with the appointment of Professor Irving Greenberg, Chairman of the Jewish Studies Department at Yeshiva University, an orthodox Rabbi with very broad contemporary interests. Professor Greenberg seemed to be the ideal choice for a City College Jewish Studies Department; he made it clear at the outset that he would not try to imitate either the Jewish Theological Seminary or Yeshiva University (but not very far from City College) but would stress the modern period.

When Greenberg assumed the Chairmanship in September 1972, he brought with him as the first major appointment, Elie Wiesel, the distinguished Jewish author of the "Holocaust." He developed a curriculum that received approbation from the Jewish student newspaper on campus (The Source) in the following terms:

> "Even to students who have attended yeshivot, the department offers study in areas and subjects that are not ever covered by the day school or the Talmud Torah."

The Source went on to say:

> "The feedback from the students seems to be very positive. The manner, content and presentation of the Jewish courses has made a favorable impression on them. Many tend to credit Prof. Greenberg with the excellent job in organization and administration of the department...From its meager beginning, the Jewish Studies Department has flourished into an exciting intellectual and scholarly experience. As for the future, City College may be slowly but surely becoming the home of one of the best Jewish Studies Departments in the American College community."

The same newspaper had lambasted me only eight months earlier because of my failure to appoint Professor Feinstein as Chairman under pressure from the Jewish Collective, thus:

> "...he (Prof. Feinstein) would be independent of the Administration's will. The last thing the President wanted was an independent, forceful chairman who could obtain student support in any controversy."

Professor Greenberg did an outstanding job as Chairman of the Jewish Studies Department. He was interested in giving prominence to the modern period, especially the Holocaust and all its ramifications, but not at the expense of Jewish history and culture. He made excellent appointments (of whom Elie Wiesel was only the best-known) and came up with some very imaginative ideas: a Research Institute for Contemporary Jewry, that would provide a focus for continuing documentation, study, and research to enable the American Jewish community to gain a greater self-understanding, and a National Jewish Conference Center, that would aim to establish close and productive working relations between lay leaders, professionals and academicians who are concerned with contemporary Jewish problems, through a system of weekend retreats. For a while, it really looked as if the City College Jewish Studies Department would become the "home of one of the best Jewish Studies Departments in the American college community".

The continuing erosion of the Jewish student base at City College - unjustifiable as I believe it was - to somewhat less than 10% (just about the same as the Asian percentage of the student population; both the Jewish and Asian percentages have stabilized in the past five years but the absolute decline of student enrollment which set in after the great fiscal crisis of 1976 obviously affected the numbers of Jewish and Asian students at City College) has hurt the morale and the prospects of the Jewish Studies Department. Eli Wiesel was wooed away by another university, the National Jewish Conference Center (a creation of the City College Jewish Studies Department) established a mid-Manhattan office, and the Research Institute of Contemporary Jewry plateaued at a modest level of operation. Professor Greenberg, himself, was persuaded to take an extended leave of absence to head up the Holocaust Commission created by the U.S. Congress to recommend a fitting American memorial to the Holocaust victims. The future of the Jewish Studies Department clearly depends on the extent to which City College itself can persuade the citizens of New York City that its commitment to equal educational opportunity has not in any way lessened its commitment to academic excellence.

§3 Interethnic Programs at City College

One of the goals which I set for the Faculty Council of the College of Liberal Arts and Science and for myself, when approval had been given by an overwhelming majority to the creation of the four ethnic studies departments, was to build "bridges" among these departments and with the traditional disciplines. In particular, I promised that the faculty of the four ethnic studies departments would give high priority to the design of an "Interethnic" course, which would first be required of the ethnic studies majors, and if successful, would become a required course for all City College undergraduates. I expressed the hope that through such a course City

266

College students would be led from their immediate group concerns to a deeper appreciation of the human condition and a fuller understnading of the social dynamics of the pluralistic metropolis of which they were a part. I had in mind a one-year course for freshmen (something along the lines of Contemporary Civilization A at Columbia College) with solid intellectual content and carefully designed by a group of sympathetic and knowledgeable faculty. I regret to say that this course never materialized during my presidency - and not for lack of trying. I should like to conclude this chapter with a brief account of the unsuccessful efforts to create teaching and research programs in "Interethnicity" and with an appeal for renewed efforts along this direction during the Eighties.

Shortly after the four new ethnic studies departments were created by the faculty, a member of the outgoing UES Department prepared a memo in which the following recommendation was made:

> "It is suggested that an interdisciplinary course covering the history of America's major ethnic groups be cross-listed by the Department of Afro-American Studies...The Course should be team-taught by members of the Ethnic Studies Departments, History, Sociology and English. This course should be required of both Majors and Concentrators in Afro-American Studies."

This recommendation was never acted upon. By February 1973, the Faculty Ombudsman, Professor Richard Goldstone (English), told a student reporter that he hoped the College would become:

> "...a resource center of interracial concerns for these urban schools in order to help them maintain the same kind of amity and understanding that we enjoy here. We must emphasize not our differences, but the essential harmony that exists among students at the College and strenghten that harmony."

By August 1973 (note that the Committee was willing to work during the summer months!), Professor Goldstone had created a "multi-ethnic" committee to design the "Intercultural Survey Course" (ISC) that would:

> "acquaint the City College student with the wide range of world culture, past and present; familiarize the student with the diversity of the College's intellectual resources; and prepare the student to cope with a pluralistic society."

While the ISC Committee could easily achieve a consensus on the objectives of the course, the detailed design of the course proved to be much more intractable. While all four ethnic studies departments were represented on the ISC Committee (in addition to other departments like Anthropology, Sociology, History and English), these departments had not had sufficient time since their inception to create bodies of knowledge and acquire the faculty expertise to make meaningful contributions through their representatives on the ISC Committee. By the same token, the non-ethnic studies departments represented on the ISC Committee had not yet learned to fold in the dimension of ethnicity into their disciplines and consequently their representatives were not prepared for serious planning. When this is added to the fact that the ISC Committee members were squeezing their deliberations into their regular duties, it is not surprising that the work of the Goldstone Committee, well intentioned as it was, ground to a halt within several months.

About a year after the Goldstone Committee stopped functioning, an opportunity arose to develop a stronger knowledge base for the design of an intercultural survey course (or an interethnic course) when the U.S. Congress appropriated some funds to the U.S. Office of Education for grants in a new program entitled "Ethnic Heritage Studies". Two members of the Goldstone Committee, Professors Amoda (Black Studies) and Paul Ritterband (Jewish Studies) were successful in securing a grant for the purpose of "Curriculum Development in Comparative Ethnicity", namely to develop ethnic and interethnic studies materials, including textbooks, in Black, Jewish, Asian, Puerto Rican and Slavic-American Studies (Irish-American and Italian-American Studies were to be added later). The idea was to appoint a specialist in each of the ethnic areas to serve as the principal researcher-scholar in his or her respective ethnic field. The participants would engage in a "collaborative process" to provide a "multi-ethnic attitude" in the exploration of a "particular ethnic experience." The major vehicle for this interethnic collaboration would be seminar workshops to maintain constant liaison and consultation among the various scholars. I was very pleased with this initiative of Professors Amoda and Ritterband and thought that a fully designed well-thought-out interethnic course might be available to City College students within several years. But as luck would have it, the same U.S. Congress that had appropriated funds for Ethnic Heritage Studies, decided the following year to disappropriate the funds. This meant that the Amoda-Ritterband project (Amoda was the Director and Ritterband the Associate Director), which had planned its work on a three-year time scale, was aborted after one year. The great fiscal crisis was then upon the College and it was impossible to sequester special College funds to continue this project.

It seems clear now that I was unrealistic about the possibility of designing an interethnic course without a great deal of preparatory work. But the Ethnic Studies Departments have now had almost a decade to demarcate their disciplines and to articulate the ethnic perspective. If ethnic studies are an integral part of liberal arts in an urban environment, as I believe they are, then it should not be unrealistic to expect City College to find the resources and the intellectual wherewithal to design an interethnic course during the Eighties that would uniquely serve the student body at City College and urban colleges throughout the country.

Chapter 6

"Training Tomorrow's Urban Professionals and Affirmative Action"

§1 Training Tomorrow's Professional Leaders for the Urban Community and Urban Legal Studies

During my last year as City College president, I came across an interesting speech by the then President of the Ford Foundation, McGeorge Bundy, delivered in 1966 to the Columbia University Charter Day Dinner. Dr. Bundy explained to his audience the significance of the special $10 million part of the Ford Foundation's $35 million grant to Columbia University at that time. He told them that the $10 million was "for the support of new efforts in the field of urban and minority affairs" and added:

> "Today, the great university in a metropolis must have a special and urgent concern for the future of the city and the future of those in our cities who lack full equality of opportunity. The great university on Morningside Heights is neighbor to one of the greatest problems and opportunities of American life - the problem and opportunity of Harlem."

City College never received $10 million - or even $1 million - from the Ford Foundation but, in many ways, the "problem and opportunity of Harlem" was the chief motivating force behind the Urban Educational Model. This was especially true of that part of Goal 2 of the Urban Educational Model which aimed to "fuse the liberal arts and professional studies into integrated curricula" in order to help "produce professional leaders capable of dealing sensitively and intelligently with the perplexing problems of the urban community." At the end of Chapter 2, I identified the four essential components of a program fitting into this framework: first, a well-defined career objective - having a clearly articulated course of study and leading to a specific degree; second, a rigorous curriculum that combines study of the liberal arts with professional subject matter to give breadth to the student's education and reinforces motivation; third, the appropriate clinical, laboratory or field experience to familiarize the student with the problems of metropolitan communities; and finally, a deliberate urban emphasis within the curriculum to sensitize the young person to the pressing needs of urban America.

The above was not just rhetoric on the part of City College to accept the broad mandate to deal with the "problem and opportunity of Harlem." City College went to work at the beginning of the Seventies to develop a series of programs that would have in common an attempt to prepare students for well-defined post-baccalaureate professional careers, and at the same time to place these career goals in an urban, humanistic, interdisciplinary context. The hoped-for result was to be a student who understood how his or her career related, in the broadest possible sense, to the urban community and who was motivated and committed to serve this community. Two integrated liberal arts - post-baccalaureate professional programs very consciously developed at City College under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model were the six to seven-year B.S.-M.D. program in Primary Care Medicine and the six-year B.A.-J.D. program in Urban Legal Studies. Both of these programs were characterized by similar academic innovation, inducements to serve the urban community, and nontraditional admissions criteria and evaluation of performance.

There are additional reasons why I should like to describe the specific designs of the Biomedical and Urban Legal Studies Programs. Soon after I arrived at City College, I realized that City University (of which City College was supposed to be the "Flagship" college) could boast of having the third largest student body in the country, but was handicapped by the absence of its own medical school (as I have said before, the Mount Sinai Medical Center was loosely affiliated with CUNY but basically was independent, with its own Board of Trustees) and its own law school (the Queens Law School was still very much in the future). I became aware of the early strictures imposed when City College was founded (see the letter by Townsend Harris mentioned in Chapter 1), on the development of medical and legal education in the public sector of higher education in New York City. But more to the point, the dominant roles played by medical and law schools - at least during the present era - in determining the reputation and influence of the contemporary American university, gave further incentive to the implementation of the Urban Educational Model in medical and law-related programs. It was clear from the outset that I could not possibly hope to establish a separate four-year medical school or a separate law school at City College but the idea of initiating B.S.-M.D. and B.A.-J.D. programs - within the framework of the Urban Educational Model and in cooperation with existing medical schools and law schools - did not seem to be

273

an insuperable task and I proceeded to move on both of these projects. While each was a major undertaking, the B.S.-M.D. program in Primary Care Medicine did accept its first class in September 1973 and the B.A.-J.D. program in Urban Legal Studies managed to start up two years later.

The basic design, the history and the broader ramifications of the Urban Legal Studies Program will be discussed in this section. The Biomedical Program - with its longer history and greater vicissitudes - will be treated in the remaining sections of this chapter. The very fact that the Biomedical Program achieved the fullest realization of the Urban Educational Model led to misunderstandings both within the City College community and outside and ultimately to the biomedical suit and the biomedical trial. The Biomedical Program became an instructive illustration of the complications that ensue for an urban university which accepts McGeorge Bundy's charge to deal with the "problem and opportunity of Harlem".

In December 1973, when the Biomedical Program had been in operation for just a few months, a memorandum from Professor Thomas Karis of the Political Science Department at City College was addressed to the president, from which I quote:

> "SUBJECT: Law School: (a) Attracting better pre-law students; (b) Improving our record of admission to law schools; and (c) Question of a City College Law School
>
> At the suggestion of Professor Randolph Braham, Chairman of Political Science, I invited Dean Joan Girgus and twelve faculty members interested in pre-legal education to meet for a discussion of the problems noted above..."

After making some recommendations about items (a) and (b), some provocative statements were made about item (c), Question of a City College Law School, as follows:

> "Should we not, with the assistance of alumni, look into the possibility of establishing a law school at City College with private financing? In the light of BHE approval of the Queens proposal, is this politically possible?
>
> We do not wish to prejudge the quality or orientation of the new law school...we agree that there is a need for a new law school that meets needs not currently being met. We are not prepared now to define the nature and orientation of such a school. To some extent it should be concerned with the aims of the Queen's proposal (as stated in the BHE minutes): 'emphasis on public service law, urban law and public interest law'...The suggestion was also made that some professional legal training could be linked with engineering, medicine, or public affairs and public analysis...Whether or not City College itself should undertake to create such a school is a different question. We think we have no illusions about the extraordinary difficulties of financing and establishing a new school in present-day circumstances..."

I agreed with Professor Karis and his colleagues that there was no way City College could pull off a new law school in Manhattan (any more than it could create a new medical school in that borough) but it did seem to me that a legal replica of the biomedical model could be envisaged without entering on a collision course with the projected Queens Law School. Before I could even extend to Professor Karis the courtesy of discussing his memo, an opportunity presented itself to create a Joint Urban Legal Studies Program with one of the existing law schools along the lines of the Biomedical Program. Literally, within weeks after receiving Karis' memo, a mutual friend introduced me to E. Donald Shapiro, Dean of the New York Law School, at the New Year's Day reception for the new Mayor, Abraham Beame, at Lincoln Center (January 1, 1974). Dean Shapiro and I agreed to meet within a week to explore the concept of a Joint Urban Legal Studies Program between our two institutions.

At our meeting in early January 1974, I explained to Dean Shapiro the basic design of the six-year B.S.-M.D. program in primary care medicine and suggested that we try to bring to fruition a similar six-year B.A.-J.D. program in urban legal studies. He was very positive about the proposal but countered with two caveats: 1) instead of following the biomedical format of four years at City College, leading to a B.S. in "Human Biology" (for which the counterpart would be a B.A. in something like "Legal Studies"), and the last two years at medical school (for which the counterpart would be the last two years at the New York Law School), he offered a joint six-year B.A.-J.D. program that would require the student to spend three years at City College and the full three years at New York Law School; 2) in place of a one-to-many relationship with medical schools (whereby City College had worked out agreements with a number of medical schools to secure a sufficient number of "guaranteed places" for its biomedical graduates), Dean Shapiro offered an exclusive arrangement with the New York Law School for a trial period of six years with a minimum of fifty "guaranteed places" for City College students. The first caveat seemed reasonable since it would not affect the integrated design of the six-year program and, in fact, it would facilitate approval by the New York State Court of Appeals. The second caveat was welcome because it would obviate the necessity of carrying on exhausting negotiations with a number of law schools for "guaranteed places" (an exercise that had consumed a great deal of time in connection with the Biomedical Program the previous year and was to consume more time during subsequent years).

With these "agreements in principle", Dean Shapiro and I anticipated that if our home institutions liked the idea, a Working Committee of four City College and four New York Law School faculty members would be established to design the cooperative six-year B.A.-J.D. program in Urban Legal Studies. Soon after this meeting, I consulted with the Dean of the Social Science Division, Joan Girgus (Psychology) and, having received a strongly positive response, asked her to appoint the four City College members of the Working Committee after consultation with the faculty. The Working Committee began its deliberations in the Spring of 1974 and forwarded its recommendations to the two institutions by September of the same year. The Urban Legal Studies Program was approved by the Board of Trustees of New York Law School within one month, by the City College Curriculum Committee within two months, and by the BHE in January 1975. The program was registered with the Department of Education of New York State in April 1975, and the first entering class was scheduled for the Fall of 1975. Because City College was accredited to grant the B.A. degree and New York Law School was accredited to award the J.D. degree, the new program did not require additional accreditation. It was also in conformity with the rules of the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, and the Court of Appeals of the State of New York. Professor Edward Schneier (of Political Science) was appointed Acting Director of the Urban Legal Studies program in January 1975.

It is of some interest to quote from the documents generated during the year preceding the enrollment of the first class in September 1975. The following statement concerning the underlying philosophy of the Urban Legal Studies program is typical:

> "A growing number of young lawyers have become interested in pursuing careers of leadership in and service to communities that are presently underserviced by the legal profession. Motivated by moral and social commitments, family values, and life styles that are at odds with more traditional career patterns, they share the concern once expressed by Judge Learned Hand that "If we are to keep our democracy there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice." But although a growing number of law schools have inaugurated innovative programs of training in such fields as poverty law, criminal justice, geriatric law, class action pleading, and consumer law, few have addressed themselves to the problem of providing a comprehensive understanding of the social, ethnic, and class contexts within which the urban lawyer must function."

In order to meet this challenge, the Urban Legal Studies Program required entering students to embark on:

> "...a three-year program at City College that combines a core curriculum in the liberal arts, introductory courses in legal analysis, substantive law courses, urban-focused law-related courses in the social sciences, and free electives. Courses on the legal process will aim at a level of sophistication comparable to that of law school courses. However, these skills are not intended as a substitute for the study of the social sciences and the other liberal arts. On the contrary, the concept of an integrated undergraduate and law school curriculum recognizes that the study of the liberal arts should extend through the period of professional training. Hence, during their three years at the law school, students will be required to take approximately ten credits in law-related courses in the liberal arts, together with certain specified courses in law, relating particularly to the problems of the urban community."

Finally, it was expected that each student would take at least one clinical law course dealing specifically with the problems of legally underserved communities and would devote one summer to an internship experience related to the problems of urban law.

Thus, the B.A.-J.D. Program in Urban Legal Studies was intended to be unique in several respects: first, through its focus on the needs and aspirations of legally underserved communities of the metropolitan area, it was designed to meet compelling social, economic, and political needs for a new kind of urban lawyer. Second, by compressing the traditional seven-year B.S.-J.D. sequence into an integrated six-year curriculum, the program reduced redundancy. Third, by introducing professional legal training to students at a point early in their curriculum, the program enabled them to assess their interest in and capacity for the full-time pursuit of a legal career while still undergraduates. Fourth, the program offered a full integration of relevant liberal arts courses with a rigorous and systematic professional approach to legal studies. And finally, the program constituted an attempt by two institutions of higher learning - one public and one private - to pool their resources and services in order to provide additional opportunities for upward mobility. For all these reasons, the Urban Legal Studies Program represented an exciting educational innovation that would both equip and motivate its graduates to respond to the city's needs.

By September 1977, the Urban Legal Studies Program at City College had a permanent director, Professor Hayward Burns, a former professor at New York University Law School and the founder of the National Association for Black Lawyers. Under his dedicated leadership, a vigorous effort was made to attract students who were economically and socially disadvantaged and who, possessing the academic credentials for the program (a high school average of 80% or better and satisfactory performance in placement exams assessing verbal and writing skills), gave strong evidence of their desire and capacity to serve the urban community. As a result, the admissions committee was consistently impressed with the maturity, self-awareness, and social sensitivity of almost all the students interviewed. The students' concerns have ranged over a rich variety of specialized areas, including landlord-tenant problems, domestic relations, minority business opportunities, legal rights of students, civil liberties and criminal justice. Many of these students had relevant personal experiences either as interns for organizations such as a legal aid society or through the legal problems of family and friends.

The students in the Urban Legal Studies Program were highly motivated and tended to perform better in the law courses (taught by New York Law School professors) during their first three years at City College than in the standarized LSAT's required of them before admission to New York Law School. This created a problem. New York Law School's standing in the Association of Law Schools depended on the mean LSAT average and not on some "unique" experiment with City College. The problem was further compounded by the fact that students from the Urban Legal Studies Program who were admitted to New York Law School, with greater weight given to their performance in the early law courses than to the LSAT scores, performed well in law school. There is certainly a lesson to be learned here and, perhaps, with sufficient good will and careful evaluation, the City College-New York Law School program will make a significant contribution to the reassessment of the role of LSAT's in law school placements. Indeed, a resassessment has already started across the country where the Mexican-American Legal

Defense Fund out of California, for example, in their recent Law School Admissions Study (1980) have stated that:

> "The innovation of the (ULS) Program (at City College), apart from its thrust toward serving groups who have traditionally been ignored or at least have been objects of benign neglect by the legal system, lies in its ability to evaluate potential law students on the basis of actual law school work they have completed."

Before concluding this brief description of the Urban Legal Studies Program, I should point out that the program is now part of the "Max E. and Filomen M. Greenberg Center for Legal Education and Urban Policy". The Center - of which the Urban Legal Studies Program is presently the chief educational component - can undertake a wide range of activities so that the students in the Urban Legal Studies Program will acquire experience with the legal contexts of the problems that beset underserved urban communities. The Center has provided members of underserved communities themselves with valuable legal information, basic legal skills and adult education courses on the workings of the legal system. The Center finally provides the mechanism for permitting the College to undertake other educational initiatives in legal education with the New York Law School or other law schools. The Center acquired its name due to the generosity of an alumnus of City College, the late Max E. Greenberg, and of his wife, Filomen M. Greenberg.

Recently, Professor Burns, who is Director of the Max. E. and Filomen M. Greenberg Center for Legal Education and Urban Policy (as well as Director of the Urban Legal Studies Program) secured a major grant from the Revson Foundation to support eight

Revson Fellows a year. Experienced public interest lawyers are brought to the City College campus on a half-time basis. The Fellows supervise students in a clinical setting in off-campus legal service agencies, develop new courses for the Urban Legal Studies Program, and act as general resource persons for the Center in the full range of its activities. The Revson Fellowship Program is a most encouraging development; as Eli Evans, President of the Revson Foundaton, said:

> "The role model of the Fellows in the classroom and as teacher-lawyers during the off-campus experience in courtrooms and neighborhoods should motivate the students in their academic work and their later careers."

Basic legal services, however, constitute just one part of the need to which the Center is directed. Lawyers have been aptly described as "the high priests of American politics," the elite corps not just of the court system but of legislatures and business enterprises as well. Not only are low and middle-income families underrepresented in this elite, but those who do become professionals often lose their identification with the continuing problems of poor and middle income communities. The Greenberg Center for Legal Education and Urban Policy will continue the City College tradition of providing opportunities for upward mobility, and for the training of community leaders in law-related fields.

§2 Center for Biomedical Education

While the Urban Legal Studies Program and the Center for Legal Education were conceptualized and institutionalized within the framework of a fully articulated Urban Educational Model for City College, the Program in Primary Health Care Medicine and the Center of Biomedical Education were designed several years earlier - even before the term "Urban Educational Model" was coined. Indeed, it was the very process of bringing into being the Biomedical Program that produced the realization that I had hit upon an educational strategy with much wider significance for the College's contemporary urban mission. This explains the centrality of the Biomedical Program to the Urban Educational Model and justifies, in my view, the detailed accounting that will be given in the rest of this chapter of its genesis, the obstacles that it encountered, and its formidable achievements. The Biomedical Program was compelled to deal with the emotional issues engendered by affirmative action and the legal suit (and trial), that confronted City College in mid-course, placed severe strains on the College community. Many sociological lessons were learned from this pioneering educational program but one of the most important outcomes was once again the College's resiliency as an institution and its capacity for growth and constructive change.

In the Spring of 1970, after I had accepted the City College presidency, Professor Abdus Salam (a co-recipient of the 1979 Nobel Prize in Physics) and I were simultaneously invited to be "Distinguished Lecturers" in Physics at the University of Texas (Austin) for approximately one week. We gave our lectures and participated in the associated scientific discussions in our speciality, theoretical particle physics, but we also had time to talk quietly about what each of us separately and together might do during the decade of the Seventies to help the "poor of this earth" (his phrase). He planned to continue as Director of the Trieste Center (The International Center for Theoretical Physics located in Trieste, Italy) dedicated to training in research of theoretical physicists from the developing countries. As President-designate of City College, I planned to preside over an institution dedicated to the education of the children of the "poor, the immigrant and the disadvantaged" in the greatest metropolis of the United States. Together, we made a compact that we would work hard to establish an International Foundation for Science (IFS) to award grants to scientists from developing countries provided that they continued their research in their own countries. The IFS was established in 1973, with headquarters in Stockholm, and has turned out to be a highly successful operation, with 400 grants outstanding in over fifty developing countries. It was within this context of commitment to helping the "poor of this earth" that I began my duties as City College President in September 1970.

I have already touched upon (in Chapter 2) my unsuccessful attempt during my first year to persuade the CUNY leadership to support the creation of a "University Center for Urban Problems" and my subsequent decision in August 1971 to undertake a City College Center for Urban and Environmental Problems. While these groping efforts to establish a comprehensive urban center at City University or at City College were going on, it became clear towards the end of my first year that the College, with the ethnic diversity of its student body and its long and distinguished tradition in science education, had an unusual opportunity to make a significant and immediate contribution in the health care field in two areas: 1) the special training of students heading for postgraduate health careers and committed to serving New York City and 2) interdisciplinary research programs on problems of urban health policy. Before long, I telephoned Dr. Arthur Logan, a distinguished Black physician and surgeon practicing in the Harlem community, and informed him that I was of the opinion that City College should give high priority to the contribution that it might make to overcoming the inadequacies of health care delivery in New York City and that I would very much welcome the advice of the Black medical community. Dr. Logan's initial response was:

"This is the first time that a White person has asked for advice about helping Black people with their health problems."

Soon - during the Summer of 1971 - Dr. Logan was inviting a small group of Black leaders in the health field to a meeting at my home and we chatted about City College and health education. Someone cited with approval a recent New York Times article listing City College in second place nationally, over a fifty-year period, among undergraduate institutions whose students had gone on to earn the Ph.D. degree. This recognized ability on the part of the College, to take in disadvantaged students and to turn out quality graduates, generated the suggestion that City College should establish a two-year medical school that would concentrate on preparing students, after two years of intensive work on its campus, to enter the traditional third year of existing medical schools. This would render important service to the minority community - so the argument went and a consensus was soon reached - by reducing the number of minority students experiencing academic difficulties during the first two years in existing medical schools due to poor mathematics and science preparation in high school and college.

The concept of creating a two-year medical school at City College that would simultaneously build on the strengths of the College and serve the minority community intrigued me greatly and I wasted little time in exploring the possibilities. I soon discovered, to my chagrin, that the AAMC (American Association of Medical Colleges) had discontinued the accreditation of two-year medical schools and so I was left with the problem of how to introduce a medical track at City College, believing that Governor Rockefeller would never consent to a move on CUNY's part to seek parity with SUNY and build another four-year medical school in Manhattan.

By chance, during the Fall of 1971, Professor Cyrus Levinthal, then Chairman of the Biology Department at Columbia University, organized a meeting to consider the proposition whether regular biology professors at Columbia College and at comparable colleges around the country could and should undertake to design and teach the equivalent of two years of basic biomedical science at the undergraduate level. Professor Levinthal invited representatives from about forty colleges, including City College. Professor Thomas Haines (Biochemistry) and Hiram Hart (Biophysics) represented City College and reported back that while there was considerable enthusiasm for the idea, the proposition would not fly because of the opposition of the medical schools. For example, Columbia's Medical School would not support Columbia College's initiative and the Johns Hopkins Medical School was equally unsympathetic to overtures from its undergraduate college. It occurred to me that the Columbia-Johns Hopkins undergraduate model could somehow replace the unacceptable two-year medical school concept for City College and that, furthermore, in the absence of a City University medical school, the threat of a medical school veto within the family need never come to pass (I reasoned that the loosely affiliated Mt. Sinai Medical Center could hardly invervene - actually the Mt. Sinai President, Dr. George James, at that time was supportive of the idea). Of course, these circumstances gave no assurance of success for a plan to provide entry into the third year of existing medical schools through the creation of an undergraduate biomedical program at City College. However, I thought that we could at least define the parameters of a possible biomedical program and explore the avenues for implementation.

By late Fall of 1971, Professor Haines emerged as the key faculty person with whom I could quietly discuss my dreams for a City College Biomedical Program. As a professor of Biochemistry, he was attuned to the range of basic biomedical courses that would have to be included in an undergraduate curriculum, and personally he had the temperament to challenge current medical education and to seek a way to train doctors, minority doctors, who would serve New York's poor. Further, as a biochemist, he was acquainted with a number of medical school faculty who were sympathetic to the goals of the nascent Biomedical Program and who were willing to devote time and energy to the informal planning in which Dr. Logan, Professor Haines and I became increasingly involved during the Spring of 1972. I am referring, in particular, to Professor Leon Weiss (then professor of Anatomy at the Johns Hopkins Medical School, a member of the university-wide committee that had recommended the rejected six-year B.S.-M.D. program for Johns Hopkins, and the person who later became the first chairman of the Advisory Committee to the City College Center for Biomedical Education) and Associate Dean Sam Rosen of the Einstein Medical School (whose practical experience in administration and knowledge of medical curriculum, student profiles and costs proved to be invaluable in ensuring realistic planning for the City College Biomedical Program). Apart from Logan, Haines, Weiss and Rosen - who met with me on a regular basis during that early planning period during the Spring and Summer of 1972 - two other persons were invaluable resources during the same period: Dr. John Hogness, President of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, and City College Vice-President for Institutional Resources Morton Kaplon. I recieved the benefit of Dr. Hogness' wise counsel during breaks in the monthly meetings of the Academy Council - of which I was a member (during the period 1971-74) and to which Dr. Hogness reported on a regular basis. Dr. Kaplon's well-known "hard-headedness" paid off at a later date when the first projected five-year budget for the Biomedical Program - which he was instrumental in preparing - came so close to the mark.

In any case, our informal planning committee was able to arrive at some basic decisions during the initial stages of its deliberations:

1) It should be possible to design a four-year integrated liberal arts - biomedical studies program that would lead to a B.S. degree from City College for well qualified students; at the end of this four-year period, the graduates of the program should be able to

pass Part I of the Medical Board Exams and enter the third year of an existing medical school. The reduction from eight to six years (for both the B.S. and M.D. degrees) could be achieved without any attenuation of the liberal arts component of undergraduate education at City College (compared, say, to that required for the normal pre-medical student) provided that a medical school subject - specifically, Gross Human Anatomy - was introduced at the freshmen level at City College. (The choice of Gross Human Anatomy was pushed by Leon Weiss - for educational, motivational and screening reasons - and turned out to be a particularly happy one.) It was understood at the outset that some students might be admitted into the Biomedical Program whose academic preparation was not commensurate with their other superior qualifications for the Program and that the four years for the B.S. degree would be extended to five.

2) It was decided that the emphasis in the City College Biomedical Program should be on primary care medicine because of societal needs, institutional appropriateness, and the richness of the field experience available in this area in New York City. This decision would also require the design of a special cluster of courses called "Health, Medicine and Society" that would be started during the freshman year at City College and would lead to subsidized internships in the City's community health agencies and community clinics during the summer months.

3) A final basic decision was that the admissions criteria for the proposed Biomedical Program would have to reflect the primary health care emphasis and therefore invoke non-academic as well as academic qualifications.

Having reaching preliminary agreement, in principle, on three major aspects of the evolving Biomedical Program at City College, our informal planning committee soon reached the conclusion that no program along the above lines could ever be launched without being able to guarantee a specified number of third-year medical school places for an appreciable fraction of the Program's graduates (say, at least 50%) and without a substantial input of non-tax-levy funds. We did not even begin to face up to the question of receiving approvals from the American Association of Medical College or the CUNY Board of Higher Education or the State Board or Regents.

While our informal planning committee was deliberating, the affluent Johnson Foundation was established, headed by Dr. David Rogers, the recent Dean of Johns Hopkins Medical School, who had supported the six-year B.S.-M.D. experiment proposed at his former institution but who had been overruled by his president. As soon as Dr. Rogers was appointed Director, he announced that the Johnson Foundation's philanthropic dollars would be focused on primary care medicine, and so we prepared an ambitious proposal for his foundation that contained our blueprint for the Biomedical Program. Not only did our submission propose radical departures in the medical curriculum but it also proposed to change the kind of physicians who were being trained in the country (in the direction of primary care medicine).

While we were trying to persuade the Johnson Foundation during the Spring and early Summer of 1972 - through a series of meetings in Princeton at its office - to support the proposed Biomedical Program, there appeared a report by a Dr. Daniel Funkenstein of Harvard Medical School, entitled "Advising Minority Group Students Enrolled in Medical School", which had considerable impact on the design of the City College Biomedical Program, especially its admissions criteria. (At the biomedical trial several years later, an attempt to read portions of this report into the record was ruled out of order by the presiding judge - see §4 of this chapter.) The Funkenstein report appeared at the end of April 1972 and was based on a study carried out under a grant from the Commonwealth Fund to contribute to the debate then agitating medical school faculties. Early in his report, Dr. Funkenstein pointed out that the increase of minority group students in medical schools came about for several reasons but that the most important were "the Civil Rights Movement and the assignment to them (minorities) of the problem of the delivery of health care to medically deprived areas." Dr. Funkenstein noted that his study (based on medical school data available before 1972) indicated that:

> "the majority male students now being admitted to medical schools are outstanding scientists who plan careers in academic medicine. They do not possess the characteristics of physicians who will deliver primary care."

Among the minority group medical students, Dr. Funkenstein observed, "the great majority are student-practitioners who plan careers related to practice" and that, among women, "the majority are student-psychiatrists with a sizable number of student-practitioners". Dr. Funkenstein attempted to explain the differentiation of career emphasis, on the average, between "majority" male medical students and "minority" medical students by suggesting that:

> "The values of the medical schools are a combination of White upper middle class values and those of science. Prized are academic achievement, competition, intellectual rigor, research and concern with abstract concepts. These are at variance with the values of many minority group students who believe that cooperation and a sense of community are more important than competition, that pragmatically applying science to the problems of patients deserves a higher priority than research and intellectual rigor."

Dr. Funkenstein further argued in this report that:

> "the results of admitting more minority group students and women, while at the same time selecting almost entirely student-scientists from the majority male pool, will be:
>
> 1. Graduating more physicians who plan careers in academic medicine and in the subspecialties than are needed. Once educated, if they cannot find positions in these areas, they may be forced into giving primary care, for which they are, by education and characteristics, unsuited. They may not do it well.

2. The immediate escalation of academic standards in the basic sciences in medical school based on these new highly scientific students, makes it more difficult for student-practitioners, who comprise the majority of minority group students, and for student-psychiatrists, who now comprise the majority of women.

3. Shifting the total responsibility for delivering primary care to medically deprived areas to minority group students."

Dr. Funkenstein concluded his report with some proposed changes in the medical school curriculum:

> "1. the time spent in medical school needs to be variable, from three years to six or seven, depending upon the student's previous preparation, and his progress in medical school... 2. needed are four curricula: a) an M.D.-Ph.D. program to educate physicians who would do research with a minimal amount of patient care; b) a bioengineering program to educate physicians who would apply engineering to medicine; c) a bioscientific program to educate physicians for bioscientifically-based specialties and subspecialties; d) a biosocial curriculum to educate physicians who would make careers in family medicine, public health, and psychiatry."

The quoted passages from Dr. Funkenstein's report make it clear why this report encouraged us to think that the preliminary design of the City College Biomedical Program was not only on target but could have national import. Manifestly, we had opted for a "biosocial" curriculum and had thereby opened up the Biomedical Program to students with a broader range of academic and non-academic qualifications, especially minority group students and women. From our vantage point, the significance of the Funkenstein report went deeper: not only would the choice of the "biosocial" curriculum make the City College Biomedical Program more hospitable to minority students and women without "quotas" but it should induce so-called "majority male students" (according to HEW guidelines, the legal minorities in the United States were "Blacks", "Hispanics", "Orientals", and

"American Indians" - everyone else was considered a member of the "majority") to pursue careers in primary health care medicine. While the Funkenstein report gave some welcome additional intellectual underpinning for the proposed City College Biomedical Program, it underlined the anticipated difficulty of persuading traditional four-year medical schools to provide guaranteed places for students entering their third year with a "biosocial" curricular training. (Interestingly, as the decade of the Seventies came to a close, many of these same medical schools began to treat primary care as a "specialization'!) Our counter-argument - which fortunately turned out to be correct - was that there would be a small number of accredited medical schools that would be sufficiently curious about the "biosocial" mode of training to acquiesce in the assignment of a reasonable number of guaranteed places to the graduates of the City College Biomedical Program. But we still lacked funds and, by the end of the Summer of 1972, our chief hope for "start-up" money failed to materialize.

To this day, I do not understand why the Johnson Foundation made its negative decision since not only would its financial support have been helpful but the professional advice of its enlightened leadership and its chief consultants would have been highly beneficial to a program so consonant with its announced priorities. Be that as it may, City College's greatest living benefactors, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Davis - who had learned about the concept of the Biomedical Program at a small alumni get-together in Palm Beach the previous winter - came to the rescue. In October 1972, I received a call from the Davises offering an anonymous gift of $1.2 million to help support the proposed City College Center for Biomedical Education during its first three years of operation. I quote certain key passages from the original Agreement between them and the College:

> "...Such a program shall provide, by agreement with at least two medical schools, the reservation each year by such medical schools of not less than 25 third-year places in such medical schools for graduates of the program who pass the required Medical Board Examinations...The objectives of this program will be to provide students with faster entry into and movement through medical school and to encourage and motivate minority students to enter medical careers so as to provide urban inner-city areas with more devoted physicians and other health professionals..."

Each term of the Agreement between the Davises and City College had its raison d'etre. Thus, the twin objectives of the Biomedical Program enunciated in the Agreement appear to be contradictory but they were not viewed so in the context of our early assessment of the Funkenstein report. It is perfectly consistent to design a medical education track that reduces the overall eight years by one or two years (the precise amount depending upon some experimentation) through reduction of duplication in the scientific component without reduction in the liberal arts component and, at the same time, to promote the entry of minority students and women through emphasis on primary care medicine. The logical and human resolution of the apparent contradiction between the two statements is to make provision for students with excellent potential and high motivation but inadequate preparation, to spend a longer time completing the Biomedical Program. Whether this is accomplished by allowing probationary status for a certain number of students (as the original Faculty Senate Resolution did - see below) or by means of a "Bridge" program from high school (also discussed below) is a matter of college policy. The Davises were charging the new City College Biomedical Program with the responsibility to help break the socially damaging cycle of under-representation of minority students and women in the medical profession without trying to specify the precise method required to achieve this goal. The first term in the Agreement cited above also showed great foresight on the part of the Davises; they were attempting to promote the stability of the Biomedical Program by insisting on the cooperation of at least two medical schools with a minimum of twenty-five guaranteed places. As it turned out, a number of the original cooperating medical schools dropped out of the program, to be replaced by others, with an actual increase in the number of guaranteed places; it would have been disastrous if the Biomedical Program had depended on a single cooperating medical school which at a later date underwent a change of heart and/or a change of mind about the program.

The announcement of the "anonymous" gift of $1.2 million in November 1972 set things into rapid motion. The Academic Committee of the Board of Higher Education (BHE) called an emergency meeting and, within weeks, recommended approval by the full BHE of the City College Center for Biomedical Education in the following terms:

> "RESOLVED, That a Center for Biomedical Education be established at The City College; and be it further RESOLVED, That The City College be permitted to accept the donor's gift which will enable the creation of the Center under the terms specified by the donor;...The Center will offer an integrated undergraduate college and medical school curriculum leading to the B.S. and M.D. Degrees within six years

> instead of the eight years now commonly required...Emphasis will be placed on accepting into the program not only highly qualified high school graduates but also highly motivated, academically disadvantaged students. The Center will also provide an opportunity for faculty research on problems of urban health care and health policy which will be specifically directed toward improving the health care delivery system in New York City and urban settings generally..."

The Faculty Senate of the College gave its approval on November 21, and followed this up with a resolution at a special meeting on December 5, 1972, instructing the newly-formed Biomedical Admissions Committee as follows:

> "WHEREAS, The B.S. Biomedical Program is intended to train practicing physicians and other health professionals to serve the urban community, be it resolved that the Program is for academically qualified students, including a very substantial number of minority students and women...That entry into the Program will be dependent on students having met academic qualifications to be defined by the Admissions Committee...Students may be admitted on a probationary basis with certain course deficiencies if deemed to have the necessary broad qualifications."

With the approval by the City College Faculty Senate and the BHE, the Center for Biomedical Education officially came into existence. I immediately appointed Professor Haines as Acting Director of the Center and the Faculty Senate Search Committee to find the first permanent director (who turned out to be Dr. Alfred Gellhorn, Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School) began to function. Curriculum and Admissions Committees were set up in accordance with the resolution of the Faculty Senate as was a Community Advisory Committee. By mid-December 1972, a recruitment brochure was written, printed and circulated to all high schools in New York City (public and private) inviting applications. The first brochure spelled out the broad framework of the program, the social purposes that it was supposed to serve, and the admissions criteria that would be applied.

While the Curriculum Committee was meeting regularly to settle the design of the first year's curriculum for the Biomedical Program and the Admissions Committee was busy with translating into specific terms the mandate of the Faculty Senate, Professor Haines and I - together with Dr. Logan, Dean Rosen and Professor Weiss - were engaged in negotiating with deans and faculties of a number of medical schools in the northeastern part of the country to line up the minimum 25 guaranteed places from at least two medical schools mandated by the Davises' benefaction. We naturally turned first to the seven medical schools in New York City, seeking 5 to 15 guaranteed third-year places for the graduates of the City College Biomedical Program; four of these seven medical schools (Mount Sinai Medical School, New York Medical College, New York University School of Medicine, and the SUNY - Downstate College of Medicine) ultimately agreed to guarantee places; three (Columbia Presbyterian Medical School, Cornell University Medical School and Einstein Medical College of Yeshiva University) declined. Several meetings were sometimes required with faculties and/or deans to present the essential features of the City College Biomedical Program and to win over skeptics.

A turning point in the New York City arena came when Dr. Ivan Bennett, Vice-President of New York University Medical Center (now Acting President of New York University) endorsed the City College biomedical experiment and persuaded the faculty of his distinguished school to accept up to five graduates of the City College Biomedical Program into their third year. At a later stage, Dr. Thomas Chalmers, President of the Mount Sinai Medical School, became a staunch supporter of the program and increased the initial commitment of Mount Sinai from five guaranteed places to a number in excess of ten. Among the medical schools outside New York City, the Howard University College of Medicine (under its then Dean Marion Mann) and the SUNY - Stony Brook School of Medicine (under its former Vice-President Edward Pellegrino and its present Dean Marvin Kushner) were most cooperative. Three other medical schools outside New York City (Meharry Medical College, the University of Puerto Rico School of Medicine and the University of Rochester School of Medicine) joined for several years but later withdrew, for fiscal reasons, lack of space or concern about the biomedical suit. These schools were replaced by the SUNY - Buffalo School of Medicine and SUNY - Upstate Medical College at Syracuse. The total number of guaranteed places steadily increased and now stands at 70-75 places, a number sufficient to take care of every graduate of the City College Biomedical Program who passes Part I of the Medical Board Exams. The minimum number of 25 guaranteed places, required by the Davises' agreement, was met in time for admission of the first class in September 1973.

By the beginning of the Spring semester of 1973, the pace of preparation for the first entering biomedical class in September of that year, quickened. A letter sent to me by the CUNY Chancellor, Dr. Robert J. Kibbee, dated March 2, 1973, reaffirmed his strong personal support and that of the BHE, and promised to pick up the operational budget of the City College Center for Biomedical Education after a five-year trial period, at the requested level of approximately $2 million per year. I had agreed to accept responsibility for raising approximately $8 million in private and federal funds (a responsibility which was discharged with the admirable assistance of Dr. Gellhorn) for the operational budget during the five-year trial period. I can convey some sense of the encouragement received from CUNY headquarters by quoting from Chancellor Kibbee's letter:

> "You are surely aware by now of the depth of commitment that the Board of Higher Education and I have for the six-year B.S.-M.D. program. As you know, this program was approved more rapidly by the Board than any other major program since I have been Chancellor. This is surely due to the broad support the program has received from Members of the Board. It is my personal hope that this program will serve as a model for other senior college units in the City University System. This Biomedical Science Program is a rational and feasible way for the City University to provide medical education for its students and especially to provide an opportunity for minority students to enter the medical profession. It does so without creating a full blown medical complex with its accompanying financial and administrative problems. In fact, it gives the University an opportunity to strengthen the M.D. granting institutions within the city both financially and by providing them with high quality students. The Center, with its gift from an anonymous donor of $1.2 million and with its efforts to seek other alumni and foundation support, has demonstrated its ability to develop a sound and responsible financial base. I can state at this time that the City University is prepared to commit substantial financial assistance to this program...Your success in obtaining outside funding will be rewarded by this commitment of the City University to take over the financial responsibility for a major portion of the program."

Two completely new courses had to be designed for the first year of the biomedical curriculum, namely "Gross Human Anatomy" and "Health, Medicine and Society". For the purpose of organizing the Gross Anatomy instruction for the entering freshmen in September 1973, Professor Haines, the Acting Director, recruited Professor Max Hamburgh, of the City College Biology Department, who for many years had been teaching anatomy to medical students at the Einstein Medical College. Some unused space in the basement of one of the older original buildings on the campus was converted into an anatomy laboratory. There, students, working in teams of four, would dissect human cadavers, thus measuring quickly their aptitude and motivation for medicine. A short time before the Anatomy course began - during the Summer of 1973 - I received a letter from a "shocked" member of the College's staff exclaiming;

> "I thought I wasn't seeing right -- I am nearsighted -- but I was. They were taking bodies, wrapped in nothing more than sheets, from a large truck...loading them onto a dolly and putting the dolly on an elevator into a campus building...Do you think that for future such deliveries, they might provide a box, if not a casket? What kind of doctors will this College produce in a climate of disrespect for the dead?"

Professor Hamburgh, doubtless no stranger to such lay reactions, responded on my behalf, pointing out that once the bodies were received by the College, they were treated with dignity. (Hamburgh's sensitivity was equally important in orienting the seventeen or eighteen-year old City College freshman enrolled in the Biomedical Program to the course in human anatomy so that they fared better in their initial contacts with human cadavers than regular medical students several years older.) The exchange, although I did not fully appreciate it at the time, was in fact a harbinger of the general shock with which much of the campus community would receive the Biomedical Program during the early years.

Another unusual feature of the curriculum was a course sequence in "Health, Medicine and Society," which in the first year was organized by my former Academic Assistant, Dr. Theodore Brown, who had migrated from his hectic administrative duties in my office to the quiet of Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study during the academic year 1972-73. He could no more resist the lure of City College than I, and was quickly recruited back to his Alma Mater in September 1973 to initiate the "Health, Medicine and Society" sequence and to serve as Assistant Director of the Center for Biomedical Education.

Two years later, in testimony before a Health Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, Dr. Gellhorn was to describe the City College Biomedical Program in terms so lucid that his entire statement should be repeated. However, I shall only quote here the section from his testimony which describes the "Health, Medicine and Society" sequence:

> "...A major component of the educational program (of the City College Center for Biomedical Education), called Health, Medicine and Society, also constitutes strong motivation for the delivery of comprehensive, continuous, personalized health care in underserved communities. This is an interdisciplinary sequence which extends throughout each of the four eleven-month academic years. It involves the social sciences of history, sociology, psychology, anthropology, ethnic studies and economics as well as clinical medicine and examines in detail the physical and social environmental factors which contribute to good and ill health. In conjunction with lectures and seminars, the students work in five large medically-underserved communities of New York -- Lower Manhattan (Chinatown and Little Italy), Upper Manhattan (Central Harlem), the South Bronx (a socio-economically deprived Puerto Rican community) and the Central Bronx (mixed poor Black and Hispanic populations). Through service in these communities, the students learn the breadth and depth of the health problems. As their knowledge and skills increase, their role in the direct delivery of primary care grows and by their third year (at City College) they are contributing service in comprehensive neighborhood health centers in prenatal and well-baby care. This facet of the program is a powerful motivation to acquire the scientific and clinical knowledge and skills; it gives the students a deep involvement with the people of the community and their health problems; and through the association with physicians and other members of the health care team who are delivering primary care where it is needed, it provides the students with role models who are likely to leave an indelible impression..."

As a further step in preparing for the first entering freshman class in September 1973, Professor Haines and I arranged for an accreditation visit by a team of the AAMC (American Association of Medical Colleges) during the Spring semester. In preparing for this visit, Professor Haines wrote a memorandum articulating the purposes of the newly-created six-year B.S.-M.D. program. Among other things, he stated that:

> "...In many ways this program is designed to solve the problems of minority students in medical programs:
>
> a. Most students from depressed areas in the inner city come from high schools which ill prepare them for college...Anatomy is graphic and requires an entirely new vocabulary which students of poorer high school background will find as new as students with excellent high school backgrounds. By emphasizing human anatomy in the first year of the program minority students will therefore be given a chance to overcome prior deficiencies and to progress on a more equal basis towards their ultimate medical degrees.
>
> b. A special counsellor program will be set up for the students.
>
> c. A special tutorial program will be set up for students to supplement their academic work, especially in physical science and mathematics..."

After studying the materials supplied by the College, the AAMC Accreditation Team paid a site visit to the campus on May 9, 1973. The AAMC Team seemed impressed with the planning and objectives of the City College Biomedical Program and approved the basic six-year B.S.-M.D. design. The rationale was that City College was authorized to award B.S. degrees (and therefore could award a B.S. degree in Human Biology) and existing four-year medical schools were authorized to award M.D. degrees to students admitted directly into their third years. This AAMC decision validated the agreements between City College and the cooperating medical schools and seemed to eliminate the last major hurdle to the admission of the first freshmen class to the

Biomedical Program in September 1973. Or so we thought!

In actual fact, the recommendation by the accreditation team out of Washington, D.C. was necessary but not sufficient to certify the admission of the first biomedical class in September 1973. When the BHE approved the City College Biomedical Program in late Fall of 1972, the Office of the State Commissioner of Education did not evince any interest in having the Program presented to it for approval and it seemed that a ruling of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (out of Washington) would suffice. However, when the City College Biomedical Program later acquired national visibility because of the charge of reverse discrimination in the admissions procedures, both the New York State Board of Regents and the State Commissioner became interested in scrutinizing the program. As a consequence, two years after the initial AAMC site visit, a Committee of the New York State Board of Medicine was asked to examine the City College program and Dr. Gellhorn arranged for a second AAMC site visit. Both evaluations were highly favorable. It is interesting to quote some statements concerning the Biomedical Program in a Report of the Regents Task Force on "Medical School Enrollment and Physician Manpower", dated September 3, 1975:

> "...The biomedical education program offered by the City College of the City University of New York is probably the most interesting and innovative experimental program in medical education today in this country...The program is designed to take students from medically underserved districts of the New York Metropolitan area who have qualified for admission by a very careful and precise operation based on academic and non-academic criteria, including high school average and placement scores on mathematics and reading tests, motivation, and some experience in working with people, particularly

in health-oriented situations. *Once accepted, the students sign a memorandum of understanding which pledges them, after graduation from medical school and completion of residency training in primary medical care, to practice for two years in an area underserved by physicians* (italics mine)...Because this is a quality program, is innovative and imaginative in its approach to medical education, and fulfills other recommendations of the Regents Task Force Interim Report, such as increasing the output of M.D.'s, increasing the delivery of primary care, and helping to correct the geographic maldistribution of M.D.'s in urban underserved areas, the Regents Task Force recommends approval of this program and its provisional registration for a period of five years prior to registration without term."

Professor Haines and I had worked hard and long during the Spring of 1973 to put into place the Biomedical Program so that the first class could be admitted in September. We believed that we had a model of medical education that could be replicated in many other colleges and universities of our country. Such a program, we thought, could help meet the demands for medical training that send thousands of young Americans each year to medical schools in Mexico or the Phillipines, or the few other places in foreign countries that would still accept them. However, our motivation was not only to experiment with medical education - important and challenging as that was - but also to increase the numbers of minority students and women in medical schools and to put doctors - family practitioners, general interns and pediatricians - into our inner cities, to help the "poor of this earth".

§3 Genesis of the Biomedical Suit

The Funkenstein Report made us confident that the City College Program in Primary Health Care Medicine could be made hospitable to minority students and women without the explicit (or implicit) use of quotas if we developed the proper mix of academic and non-academic admissions criteria. The "biosocial" route in medicine (using Funkenstein's terminology) obviously could not be pursued by students below a certain academic level; thus the challenge for the Biomedical Admissions Committee was to identify the non-academic criteria - personality traits, motivation and social commitment - that would increase the likelihood that those completing the program would practice medicine in the underserved urban communities. It was clear, as it set policies, that the Admissions Committee would play a key role in the operation of the Biomedical Program; unfortunately, the Committee was not sufficiently meticulous and its lapses made a legal suit possible.

The Admissions Committee was an instrument of the City College Faculty Senate during the first few years of operation of the Biomedical Program - until the Center for Biomedical Education developed its own set of bylaws under the directorship of Dr. Gellhorn. When the Center for Biomedical Education became the autonomous Sophie Davis School for Biomedical Education in 1978, the Faculty Senate relinquished control over the Biomedical Program. As a creature of the Faculty Senate, the Admissions Committee reflected in its initial membership a balance of academic and ethnic interests. As authorized by the Senate, the Admissions Committee consisted of 15 members representing a reasonable mix of departments and schools. Provision was made by the Senate for the president to select two or three members of the Admissions Committee, in consultation with the Director. During those early years - before Dr. Gellhorn took charge - I used this authority to choose people with outside medical school experience. The first Admissions Committee, appointed rather hurriedly, was chaired by Professor Robert Goode (of the Biology Department), who also headed up the College's Premedical Advisory Committee. After several meetings, the Committee designed the following admissions procedures: each applicant was to submit a written application, a transcript of his or her high school record, SAT scores (if available) and three letters of reference. The Committee divided itself into five groups of three, and each prescreened applicant was to be interviewed by one of these groups, which then would write an assessment of the applicant for the program. The final decisions were to be made by the full Admissions Committee.

Despite the fact that the program was approved in December, 1972, and the deadline for applications set for March 1, 1973, the applicant pool on the first go-around consisted of 850 students, of whom 65 were placed by the Committee at its final meeting on March 13 into a "highly recommended" category. The inexperienced Committee, however, had not indicated a date by which transcripts from the high schools were to be submitted. Besides this, many high school counselors were under the impression that only one transcript needed to be sent to the central Admissions Office of CUNY. However, a separate transcript was required by the City College Biomedical Admissions Committee since the biomedical decisions were being made much earlier than the CUNY decisions for normal college admission. A later annual report from the

Biomedical Center laconically recorded this problem; "It was noted immediately that nearly three hundred applicants had not submitted transcripts." The Committee, the report continued,

> "requested that all these students be given a new deadline for transcript submission and decided to interview and consider all such applicants with the same rigor that had been applied to the first group. It is interesting to note that a survey of this applicant pool (without transcripts) indicated that 7/9 of them were minority students."

The report's "interesting notation" reached the newsroom of "American's Largest Weekly", The Amsterdam News, a newspaper distributed primarily in Manhattan. The paper, on May 26, 1973, printed a story that contained a charge released by the Harlem Hospital Center Community Board. The charge was summarized in the story's page one headline, "City College Used Blacks as Money Bait." The story reported "a major reason for the paucity of Blacks" in the first Biomedical Class was the fact:

> "that 287 students were not interviewed because their transcripts did not arrive from their high schools. And Ms. Dorthy Gordon [my Special Assistant for Community Affairs] disclosed that 80 percent of those left out were Black."

Reporting that the "freshman class that had been recruited for September 1973 consisted of 30 White, 12 Orientals, 11 Puerto Ricans and 5 Blacks," The Amsterdam News story continued,

> "The Harlem board members demanded that the program be increased so that Black students are a majority of the total number of freshmen for September 1973 and the years to follow."

A Puerto Rican community leader also complained about the outcome of the Admissions Committee's deliberations in a letter addressed to me:

> "As a person directly involved in the delivery of health services to the Lower Eastside community, I recognize the need for more Puerto

Rican and Hispanic representation in the medical professions. Educational opportunities then, become very crucial to meeting the health needs of our communities. Therefore, I wish to express my dissatisfaction in the recruitment activities demonstrated by your Biomedical Education program for the freshman class. These efforts have failed to include a larger representation of qualified Puerto Rican and Hispanic students and consequently reflect tokenism - I believe we're past that stage as far as the City University is concerned."

It is worth noting that as early as January 3, 1973, the Community Advisory Committee to the Biomedical Program unanimously passed a resolution "to the Admissions Committee to make sure that at least 50% of the students are Black, Puerto Rican and Asian students" and that at a meeting a couple of months later, this community group resolved that "Asians not come out of the minority quotas but rather be included in the White total". At the May 17, 1973 meeting of the Community Advisory Committee, it is recorded in the minutes, moreover, that "the recommendation that 50% of the spaces be filled by Black and Puerto Rican students *was voted down by the Admissions Committee*". (italics mine). The City College Biomedical Program *never* established quotas for *any* category of students. (Judge Marvin Frankel disregarded these official records when he rendered his verdict after the biomedical trial - see §4.)

In the midst of these early and troubling warnings, the Admissions Committee completed its work. In the end, the Committee invited 83 applicants and enrolled 62 students in the first biomedical class (of whom 30 were women - thus in this instance, fulfilling the Funkenstein prediction, for no quotas had been established to attract either women or minority students). The academic and ethnic characteristics of the first class admitted to the Biomedical Program appear in the table below:

	Invited	HSA	Enrolled	HSA
BLACK	18	87%	12	87%
HISPANIC	18	87%	14	87%
CAUCASIAN	34	91%	29	90%
ASIAN	13	92%	7	90%

I have given the ethnic breakdown and precise totals of students admitted to the Biomedical Program because small differences in these numbers the following year precipitated the biomedical suit.

The expectation on the part of at least some of the Black and Puerto Rican leadership in the City that the Biomedical Program would automatically enroll a proponderance of Black and Hispanic students was countered with a rising uneasiness on the part of City College faculty that students whose high school averages and whose test scores were superior might be passed over in favor of other students whose commitment to medical practice in the service of the poor was judged to make them the preferred candidates. The fact that the BHE and the Faculty Senate itself had approved just such an admissions system, as well as the fact that admissions criteria not based on academic standing alone made up the better part of the process for admission to some of the country's most prestigious colleges did not relieve the faculty's suspicions that any criteria beyond grades and tests smacked of quotas. The Chair of the Faculty Senate, Professor Alice Chandler (of the English Department), who later become Provost and Acting President of the College, privately voiced her concern to me that non-quantifiable criteria in a public institution could trigger a law suit (she was right). I cite these examples to show that even those faculty who were supportive of my goals and who served with me for many years in senior positions at the College were uncertain about the non-academic aspects of the biomedical admissions criteria. In this connection, someone recently asked me why I had not realized that "If you put water out in the desert, people will kill each other to get it." I answered that I had, perhaps naively, believed that persons, finding water where none had existed before, would share it among themselves. My former assistant, Dr. Theodore Brown, who was with us shook his head, saying, "No, what we didn't realize was how dry the desert really was."

Some mention also should be made of the New York atmosphere in which the program opened. The city's public schools in 1968 had undergone a traumatic and bitter strike centering over the firing of several White teachers by a Black community board in the Ocean Hill - Brownsville district. On the first day after this action, Albert Shanker, the new teachers' union head, tested his members' commitment and 53,000 out of 57,000 teachers failed to show up for work. Many months of anger and street confrontations, severe enough to require police, finally ended in a tense agreement, but the polarization between New York City's Black citizens and her Jewish citizens was a rupture that had not healed as evidenced by the first hostile queries about admissions to the City College Biomedical Program made in 1973.

In the Summer of 1973, the Search Committee appointed by the Faculty Senate to find a permanent Director of the Center for Biomedical Education intensified its activities and I became personally involved in generating highly qualified candidates. One day, my cousin, Dr. Robert R. Marshak (Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania) - to whom I had described the City College Biomedical Program some months earlier - phoned me to suggest the name of the person whom he thought would strongly support the concepts underlying the Biomedical Program and who possessed all the qualities of distinction, sensitivity and leadership that would "make the program fly". This person was Dr. Alfred Gellhorn, then Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School (and former Director of the Institute of Cancer Research at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons). My first meeting with Dr. Gellhorn - at his country home near Catskill, New York - was not encouraging but I finally persuaded him to meet with the Search Committee. Apparently, the enthusiasm of the Search Committee for the Biomedical Program was infectious, for Dr. Gellhorn responded positively to their unanimous vote to invite him to serve as the first Director of the City College Program for Biomedical Education. Dr. Gellhorn agreed to begin his new duties on January 1, 1974. That meant that it would still remain Acting

Director Haines' responsibility to activate an Admissions Committee to process the applications for the second class that would be received in September 1974.

Since it was the work of this Admissions Committee that ultimately led to the biomedical suit, I shall recount in some detail its decisions and procedures as the academic year 1973-74 unfolded. The first act of the 1973-74 Admissions Committee, when it met in early Fall 1973, was to elect as its Chair, Professor of Physics Philip Baumel and Assistant Dean for Curricular Guidance in the College of Liberal Arts and Science. Under his chairmanship, the Admissions Committee drew up a more precise statement of the criteria that would be used to select the second biomedical class (for September 1974). The statement of criteria appeared in the Program's brochure sent to all interested parties and read as follows:

> "Evaluation of the student will be based on academic performance and potential, work or volunteer experience, and personal qualities. The Admissions Committee will especially consider motivation, maturity, and social commitment. There will be no de-emphasis on academic considerations, as students must be capable and prepared to enter an accelerated professional program. Nonetheless...academic performance will carry the same weight as demonstrated willingness and capacity to serve the urban community."

It should be noted that the Biomedical Admissions Committee, in setting the process into motion of selecting the 1974 class, placed equal emphasis on non-academic qualifications, such as motivation, maturity, interest in people and in the urban community, as on academic qualifications. This recruitment brochure was supplemented by a recruitment drive organized by Dr. Marjorie Henderson, Director of the Office of Black Program Planning and Development at the College (see Chapter 7), and her counterpart, Ms. Yolanda Sanchez, Director of the Office of Puerto Rican Program Planning and Development.

The second Admissions Committee tried to develop more uniform criteria to be used in the screening and interviewing of applicants. Based on the performance of the previous class, the Committee noted the academic rigors of the Biomedical Program. This led to a decision to raise the minimum high school average of 80% to 85%, unless there was strong counter-evidence. The selection mechanism went through a complicated set of stages:

1) A preliminary screening was done by the Registrar's Office for compliance with the technical conditions for entrance into the program. These technical conditions were: age under 26 years, completeness of application, transcript, letters of reference, and no more than four college courses.

2) A second screening was done by two three-person committees with review by a third three-person committee, all of whom were members of the overall Admissions Committee. The purpose of this screening was to eliminate those who were clearly unqualified academically and non-serious applicants -- those who, for example, had submitted one or two sentence essays.

3) A final phase for those who had survived earlier screening consisting of an interview conducted by a two-person team in which the applicant was questioned in areas defined on an interview form. The interview form contained ten items intended primarily to assess the non-academic qualifications of the applicant and included questions that would elicit "a demonstrated interest by the student in urban medicine either through special school or voluntary work in health or community agencies", "assess the student's ability to examine community events and issues at more than a superficial level", "elicit from the student his or her degree of commitment to extracurricular

activities, especially those that had a social-mission purpose", and so forth. The interviewers were to score each candidate in the ten items on the interview form on a scale of zero to ten.

4) At the end of the interview, each interviewer was to make one recommendation -- "Accept", "Reject", "Hold", or "Math Hold." The "Math Hold" category was for persons with outstanding overall qualifications but who would need additional mathematics instruction. Where the two interviewers of a team disagreed on their recommendation, the candidate was to be interviewed by another team or by a third person to determine the category into which he or she would be placed.

Up to this point the Admissions Committee had developed what appeared to be a reasonable and equitable set of procedures. The recruitment brochure was mailed out at the beginning of October (1973). Within a month, the interviewing teams were in place. Trouble again occurred at the high school level; high school counselors declined to forward biomedical applications to City College as soon as they were completed, insisting instead that the applications would be forwarded at the same time as they were sent to the CUNY Processing Office with the applications for college admission. Thus, nearly 1300 applications for the Biomedical Program descended upon the Admissions Committee during the latter part of January (1974). After the initial technical screening by the Registrar, this number was reduced to approximately 600 candidates, but only about six weeks remained before the deadline for selecting the successful candidates. It was evident that the interviewing load could not be carried by the Admissions Committee alone. All available teaching faculty in the Biomedical Program were drafted to join the interviewing process. Despite the sound theoretical design of the Admissions mechanism to match the objectives of the Biomedical Program, the last interviewing stage of the process became flawed in the rush to meet the deadline. The deficiencies in the interview procedures were summarized by Chancellor Kibbee at a later date (June 1974):

> "(a) Prospective interviewers were inadequately oriented regarding the purposes of the Program, its rigorous nature and the criteria being used.
>
> (b) Prospective interviewers were inadequately prepared to conduct interviews in a way that would assure some uniformity of approach, evaluation, and recommendation.
>
> (c) The value of solid interviews conducted in a reasonably uniform manner in which all interviewers understood what characteristics they were looking for and what constituted reasonable evidence of commitment to primary health care and to urban practice was largely dissipated by lack of adequate preparation."

Let me quickly complete the story of the selection of the 1974 Biomedical class, as I understood it, based on records, minutes and the trial transcript, as well as my own inquiries. As a result of interviews, the list of approximately 600 students was reduced by more than a factor of two. The approximately 250 students recommended for consideration by the entire Admissions Committee had been placed in one of the three positive categories - Accept, Hold, or Math Hold. More specifically, the interview process had produced the following numbers ("Minority" designates Black, Hispanic or Asian - in compliance with Federal HEW guidelines):

Class of 1974 - Biomedical Program

	Students Interviewed	Students Accepted*	Students Rejected	Percent Accepted*
White	332	124	208	37.4
Minority	267	123	144	46.1
TOTAL	599	247	352	41.2

*Accepted here means recommended to the Admissions Committee in one of the three categories -- Accept, Hold, Math Hold.

Two meetings of the full Admissions Committee further screened the 247 applicants who had survived the previous screenings. At these meetings each candidate was discussed and interviewers were asked to defend their ratings with particular emphasis upon their judgment regarding the individual's commitment to primary medical care and to practicing medicine in the urban community. These two meetings did not produce an appreciable reduction in the number of acceptable candidates but did establish some consensus on how the final list of successful applicants might be chosen. The last meeting of the Admissions Committee was held at the Columbia Faculty Club on March 28, 1974, the day before the final list had to be sent to the City University's Applicating Processing Center. This meeting started at 5 P.M. and shortly before 10 P.M. - when the Faculty Club had to be vacated - the Committee found that its deliberations had reduced the list of candidates to 94-96 "Accepts", 24-30 "Holds", and about a dozen students in the "Math Hold" category, or a total group of about 130-135. The disparities in numbers were due to the fact that the Associate Registrar, who was assisting the Committee, and the Admissions Committee Chairman, were maintaining separate master lists and there was no time to reconcile these lists. (The Associate Registrar had 94 names on the "Accept" list as compared to the Admissions Committee's Chairman's 96 names; for reasons explained below, we shall stick with the 96.)

The Committee, I was later told, considered itself to be in serious trouble. Even eliminating the "Holds" and "Math Holds", it felt that offering admission to the 94-96 "Accepts" would yield a 1974 freshman class that would be too large. (Ironically, this was a miscalculation; ultimately, 92 students were invited into the 1974 freshman class, and only 68 accepted.) The list had to be reduced before the next morning and it was decided that this reduction would be accomplished by a Subcommittee of four, consisting of Professors Baumel and Brown, Dr. Henderson and Ms. Sanchez. There were, it later seemed, vague or conflicting instructions given to the Subcommittee as to how it was to fulfill its charge of coming up with approximately 70 final "Accepts" and with an ordered list of alternates. The Subcommittee retired to a colleague's nearby apartment and completed the first part of this assignment by 3 A.M. but was too exhausted to come up with the alternate list - an inability which created serious problems later.

The procedure followed by the Subcommittee that night to produce a final acceptance list (as it was later explained to me) was to review the entire list of available candidates (Accept, Hold, Math Hold) with particular concern for evidence of commitment to primary care medicine and to urban practice. In the process, the Subcommittee decided to give less weight to the scores of those teams that had come up with consistently high ratings for all the candidates whom they interviewed. By reexamining all candidates on the three lists, the Subcommittee arrived at a final acceptance list of 79. The final list was composed of 75 candidates from the earlier "Accept" group of 96 and four candidates from the earlier "Hold" group. Of the 21 candidates eliminated by the Subcommittee from the previous list of "Accepts", 14 were Caucasian (the terms White and Caucasian are here used interchangeably), 2 Hispanic and 5 Asian. Of the 4 added from the earlier "Hold" group, 2 were Caucasian, 1 Black, and 1 Hispanic. For lack of time, the names of the 79 students were sent directly to the University's Admission Processing Center without being brought back to the full Admissions Committee for its final approval.

The Subcommittee's work was not over. Of the 79 students eventually offered admission, 19 declined and 60 accepted. Yet because the Program had places for approximately 70 students, the Subcommittee was requested by Dr. Gellhorn to identify additional students for admission. The failure of the Subcommittee to produce an ordered alternate list at the same time that it had produced the final acceptance list, now came home to roost and touched off a controversy within the Subcommittee when it was discovered that the percentages of declinations were markedly different among the different ethnic groups. The percentage of students who declined admission was largest for the Black applicants and the Black member of the Subcommittee, Dr. Henderson, argued at first that all replacements should be chosen from an ordered list of Black alternates. The dispute was finally resolved by replacing candidates from the four ethnic groups (Black, Hispanic, Asian and Caucasian) in accordance with the percentages of declinations. As in the case of the acceptance list, the Subcommittee's final alternate list was not subjected to the scrutiny of the full Admissions Committee. The profile by race and sex of students interviewed, invited and accepted in the biomedical freshman class of 1974 is given in the table below:

Composition of the 1974 Biomedical Class

	Male	Female
BLACK		
Interviewed	49	62
Invited	10	18
Accepted	8	14
HISPANIC		
Interviewed	54	43
Invited	10	9
Accepted	10	4
ASIAN		
Interviewed	41	18
Invited	6	5
Accepted	2	3
CAUCASIAN		
Interviewed	243	89
Invited	22	13
Accepted	17	10

The above table was sent over to me by the Director of the Biomedical Center, Dr. Gellhorn, as soon as it became available. It was normal procedure for Dr. Gellhorn to give me a preview of any student and staff information concerning the Biomedical Program before its release to the City College community and/or the public since this type of information was carefully monitored by the various ethnic groups at City College and in New York City. Dr. Gellhorn, however, did not keep me informed of the day-to-day operation of the Biomedical Program (a practice I encouraged among all my senior administrators). I was therefore not aware of the sequence of events which led up to the production of the table but nevertheless examined it with interest when it arrived. I noted, of course, that the chance of being invited into the Biomedical Program was about twice as high for minority students as compared to Caucasian students but this seemed to be only slightly larger than the comparable ratio (1.8) for Caucasian females compared to Caucasian males. I was not disturbed by these results since I reasoned that giving equal weight to non-academic as to academic qualifications could favor minority students and women to essentially the same degree. The numbers were consistent with the City College Faculty Senate Resolution and supported the conclusions of the Funkenstein report, that women and minority students were more likely to be interested than Caucasian males in primary health care, community medicine and psychiatry. I was therefore totally unprepared when I opened The New York Times on May 9, 1974 to find a lead article carrying the statement of one of City College's deans that:

> "the administration of the biomedical program has succumbed to pressure of the East Harlem community to fill about 50 percent of the program's highly sought-after spaces with Blacks and Puerto Ricans".

The New York Times went on to say that:

> "Dean (Harry) Lustig yesterday cited what he considered to be several cases in which admissions decisions were made on the basis of racial preference for minorities. He lamented what he called Dr. Marshak's 'persistence' in denying that a quota system was present in the admissions process. 'My own view is that maybe a quota is defensible,' Professor Lustig said, 'but we shouldn't get into a Nixon situation of denying it exists. We have to admit it's going on and then try to defend it."

These sharp words, coming from one of the College's highly regarded deans, stunned me. Dean Lustig was one of the few members of the Administration who had supported my resolve to launch the Biomedical Program at the earliest possible date - in contrast to most other members of the Administration who had cautioned delay and further study. (The problems engendered by the biomedical suit might be taken as vindication of this point of view but I am convinced that any delay in initiating the Biomedical Program would have ultimately resulted in inaction and the failure of the Urban Educational Model to get off the ground.) Moreover, Dean Lustig had always prided himself on observing protocol and it seemed very strange that he had not taken the trouble to forewarn me of what he considered to be a reprehensible state of affairs in the Biomedical Program. Finally, since Dean Lustig had not been personally involved in the admissions process for the 1974 Biomedical class - any more than I had been - I was surprised by the specificity and concreteness of his allegations. The accusation of knowingly defending "quotas" went so contrary to my own deeply-held views and was so diametrically opposed to the spirit of the many decisions that had been taken since the Biomedical Program was created, that I immediately started my own personal investigation of what had transpired.

Dr. Gellhorn was in California when the Lustig story broke, so I began by calling in Dean Lustig and asked him to explain the basis of his allegations. I told him that if he was upset by the table containing the ethnic and sex breakdowns of the applicants for the 1974 Biomedical class who had been interviewed and invited into the Program, the appreciably larger percentages of acceptees to interviewees among minority students and women could easily be explained by the Funkenstein findings. He countered that while he was disturbed by these statistics, the clincher came when the Chairman of the Admissions Committee had told him some "hair-raising" stories about the admissions procedures, with which he thought I must have been familiar (I was not). He simply decided to "blow the whistle". If true, these stories could result in legitimate charges of reverse discrimination by the College. Clearly, my next move was to see the Chairman of the Admissions Committee. Professor Baumel came to my office on May 12 to brief me on what had happened and why.

Professor Baumel denied that he had informed Dean Lustig of the use of "quotas" by the Admissions Committee during any stage of its deliberations but admitted that he had expressed his unhappiness to his old friend, Harry Lustig, about several incidents he felt were ethnically and racially motivated, that had occurred during the admissions process at the "Subcommittee level" (let us recall that the Subcommittee which met into the early hours of the morning of March 29, consisted of Baumel, Brown, Henderson and Sanchez). Professor Baumel's narration of these incidents was highly disturbing and led me to request a memorandum within 24 hours that would place in writing his oral statements. This memorandum, dated May 13, 1974, said, among other things (the "Yes" and "Accept" categories are used interchangeably):

> "At the end of the final meeting of the Admissions Committee, there remained approximately 90 names in the "Yes" category. The Committee was told by Dr. Gellhorn that no more than 70 students could be admitted. The Committee could produce no rational, systematic procedure for reducing the number in the "Yes" category. At that point, a count by ethnic category and sex was made, and the Committee decided that the reduction should be done in the "*Caucasian-male*" category (italics mine). Dr. Gellhorn suggested

> that a Subcommittee of Baumel, Brown, Henderson and Sanchez do that selection, and that this subcommittee prepare an alternate list from those selected out and from those names in the "Hold" list. The subcommittee..., after several hours, selected out a group of *male-Caucasians* (italics mine), principally by selecting out those students with the weakest history of participation in community and health-related activities."

Professor's Baumel's statement (coming from a person whose affection for the College was well known) was so disconcerting to me that I immediately decided that if further investigation on my part confirmed the recollection of the Chairman of the Admissions Committee of the course of events during that very trying night, I would make some extraordinary decisions about the group of eliminated Caucasian males, such as finding a way to admit them with the rest of the 1974 biomedical class and I so informed Chancellor Kibbee and the BHE Chairman, Alfred Giardino. Clearly, it was important to probe the memories of all other members of the Subcommittee. However, because Dean Baumel, in his May 13 memo, had informed me that Dr. Henderson and Ms. Sanchez had not really participated in the decision-making that night, it seemed sensible to pursue my investigation by talking with Professor Brown. Professor Brown's recollection of what had transpired during the nightmare of the Subcommittee's meeting did not confirm Baumel's statement. Utterly confused, I instructed Baumel and Brown to scrutinize all applications in the "Accept", "Hold" and "Math Hold" categories wich they carried with them into the Subcommittee meeting to refresh their memories, and to report their joint "findings of fact". The meeting with Baumel and Brown took place on June 3 rather than earlier, because I was called out of town by the fatal illness of my father. Dramatic in its consequences, the day of this meeting is described here to the best of my recollection.

During the morning of June 3, 1974, while Professors Baumel and Brown were reconstructing the sequence of events at the Subcommittee meeting during the fateful night of March 28-29, I was attending the monthly meeting of the Council of Presidents at CUNY headquarters on East 80th Street, chaired by Chancellor Kibbee. After this meeting, I personally briefed Chancellor Kibbee on the contents of the Baumel memo and told him of my forthcoming meeting at noon with Baumel and Brown. I told him, as I told BHE Chairman Giardino (whom I stopped to brief on the way out to my car for the trip back to City College), that I would recommend automatic admission for the whole group of "Caucasian males" that had been eliminated, if Baumel's charge stood up. Within a half-hour, I was meeting with Professors Baumel and Brown for what we all knew would be a critical meeting for the future destiny of the Biomedical Program.

What emerged from the June 3 meeting was evidence - provided by both Baumel and Brown - that the Subcommitee had not produced the final list by eliminating only Caucasian males from the list of "Accepts". Baumel agreed with Brown that while someone might have shouted "eliminate enough Caucasian males" during the last hectic minutes before the 10 P.M. adjournment time of the entire Admissions Committee on March 28 at the Columbia Faculty Club, this was not a formal instruction of the Admissions Committee and no such instruction was given to the Subcommittee by Dr. Gellhorn. Rather, their memory supported the view that the weary Subcommittee on March 28 and into the morning of March 29 sifted through about 130-135 applications to select a short list of approximately 70 names for admission to the 1974 Biomedical class. Some sense of the pressure under which the Subcommittee worked was communicated by Professor Baumel during his testimony at the trial. He said:

> "I assumed that virtually all the students whose records we took off to consider in the Subcommittee meeting deserved to be admitted; that we had to pick at straws, we had to look for perhaps inconsequential reasons to eliminate, rather than search for reasons to admit...We, as I remember, went through folder and folder looking, as I said, for reasons to say 'No.'"

Baumel and Brown told me at the June 3 meeting that they had not pursued the relatively simply avenue of culling from the "Accept" category but that in their zeal to do justice to the candidates and correct for what they perceived as non-uniformity in the decision-making by the full Admissions Committee (a posture of omniscience which they both said they deeply regretted), they had even dug into the "Hold" categories. The outcome was that they had eliminated 19-21 names from the "Accept" category - 12 Caucasian males, 2 Caucasian females, 5 Asians and 0-2 Hispanics (0 if the working sheets of the Associate Registrar had been used but 2 if Baumel's working sheets had been used). It was not clear to me at the June 3 meeting whether both Baumel and the Associate Registrar's sheets were used by the Subcommittee or just Baumel's working sheet but it did become clear at the trial that the latter was the case. In addition, Baumel and Brown had moved 4 names from the "Hold" categories into the final list, of which 2 were Caucasian, 1 Hispanic and 1 Black. Apart from the fact that Brown and Baumel could be criticized for trying to "play God" by digging into the "Hold" categories, the last piece of information indicating that, having done so, they moved 2 Caucasian males of the 4 "Holds" onto the final list, simply did not jibe with the existence of an unspoken quota and a mandate to eliminate only Caucasian males. I was convinced by the June 3 meeting that Professors Baumel and Brown, two of City College's most intelligent and dedicated faculty, had made a valiant effort, under the most difficult circumstances, to select a 1974 class that in their judgment would be most likely to fulfill the objectives of the Biomedical Program.

The June 3 meeting with Professor Baumel and Brown did not, however, end on a completely reassuring note. Baumel and Brown informed me that the Subcommittee had concluded its work at 3 A.M. on the morning of March 29 too exhausted to come up with an alternate list in addition to the final list of acceptees. Consequently, when 19 of the 79 students who were offered admission sent in declinations and it seemed desirable to offer admission to some additional students to bring the 1974 class up to 70, a vehement dispute arose over which students to select. This issue, they told me, had been resolved by the Subcommittee - without referring the matter back to the entire Admissions Committee - by drawing up a rank-ordered list of candidates within the four ethnic categories (Caucasian, Black, Hispanic and Asian) and then offering invitations to additional students in the same ethnic ratio as those who had sent in declinations. While this last revelation did not alter my view concerning the basic integrity of the admissions process through the first 79 acceptances into the Biomedical Program, the use of four ethnic lists to select alternates according to the

320

numbers of declinations was "mistaken" and "unwise" (terms which I used publicly soon thereafter to characterize the final stages of the 1974 admissions process). While the actions of the Subcommittee in the selection of the small number of alternates did not, strictly speaking, use "quotas" - since there was no a priori way to predict the numbers of declinations - they were based exclusively on "ethnic considerations" (contrary to the Supreme Court decision two years later in the Bakke case). At the time I believed that this action of the Subcommittee was misguided and would open up a pandora's box of charges of "quotas" and "reverse discrimination". My fears that these procedural defects would become a cause célèbre proved to be all-too-well-founded.

News of the imagined and real flaws in the 1974 biomedical admissions process spread quickly in ethnically-conscious New York City. A sampling of views communicated to my office concerning the 1974 biomedical admissions process is indicative of the intensity of feeling over this issue in each major ethnic community. An official of a major Jewish organization posed two questions to the College:

> "1. How many students with averages below 85% were admitted to the Biomedical Program and how many of these were from minority groups - broken down into Black, Puerto Rican, Asian, etc.? 2. If there was a waiting list, were those on that list given a numerical ranking, or, if someone selected did not accept admission, did they take someone from the same ethnic group from the waiting list to replace the position of the person originally selected?".

Clearly, information concerning the selection of the 1974 class had been widely communicated. The father of a student who was not admitted to the Biomedical Program wrote:

"A perusal of names of selected students reveals a pattern of excessive admittance of Jewish applicants and a gross rejection of Italians...Further, as many Asians as Italians were admitted, and as I have no quarrel with them, based on population ratios, how is this justified? My main quarrel is with a system that is geared to accept a disproportionate number of Jews, allowing them to hog and dominate the student body of this desirable program, while allowing only tokenism, where the Italians are concerned.".

Finally, I quote from a Black community leader:

"If those who criticize the program are really concerned about discrimination, they should not waste their energies trying to destroy what they all agree is an exceptional, much-needed, innovative and experimental program...It should be strongly pointed out that the cards are stacked against minority group members who apply to the city's traditional medical schools -- schools that use the traditional narrow criteria of grades and test scores for selecting their students... For example, here are two questions from last year's Medical College Admissions Test: "Who composed the Jupiter Symphony?" "What is a Stem Christi?" If those questions do not imply a cultural bias, what does?".

During the first two weeks of June, the situation warmed up with many charges and countercharges being aired publicly. A letter was sent to Dr. Gellhorn by Professor Julius Shevlin (Chairman of the Department of Physical and Health Education) stating that:

"during my participation on the Committee, the only quota that was ever stipulated was the total number of candidates to be admitted to the program based upon fiscal and academic constraints and medical school acceptance guarantees. As far as I am aware and in all of the Committee deliberations that I participated in, there was never any stipulated, suggested, or implied quotas based on ethnic or racial considerations..."

I reported to Chancellor Kibbee on my June 3 meeting with Professors Baumel and Brown since he was undertaking his own investigation of the biomedical admissions process. Some of the conclusions and observations contained in his public report issued on June 18, 1974 are worth quoting:

"1. The program in Biomedical Education at City College was carefully designed to achieve multiple objectives. The objectives are sound and forward-looking and are most appropriate for City College at this point in its history.

2. The criteria for admission to the Program have been clearly stated in general terms and are appropriate to the objectives of the Program. No fair reading of the pertinent documents should lead a prospective candidate, a counsellor or a member of the community to assume that admissions to the Program would be made on the basis of high school grades or test scores alone no matter how superior these indices might be. No fair reading of these documents should lead one to believe that grades and test scores were the most important criteria for admission beyond the point where previous academic performance had established the student's ability to cope with the rigors of the Program.

3. The theoretical design of the admissions mechanism, i.e., technical screening, interviews, and final consideration by the full Admissions Committee was appropriate to the objectives of the Program and a reasonable procedure for applying the criteria for admission.

4. The actual operation of interview procedures left much to be desired...There is, however, no substantial evidence that the breakdown of the interview system favored any particular group. Although minority students survived the interview process at a higher rate than Caucasian students, the difference was not so great that it could not reasonably be explained by other considerations. The major effect of the interview weaknesses seems to have been the unnecessarily heavy burden it placed on the Admissions Committee later in the process.

5. In the final stage, when it was necessary to replace some of those who had declined, the procedures as they had been originally perceived,broke down...

6. It seems clear that in the evaluation of individuals, once a reasonable level of academic potential had been determined, the nature and level of the candidate's commitment to primary health care and service to the urban community were of greater importance than the previous academic record of the student. Exceptionally high grades and test scores could not overcome doubts about the candidate's ultimate interests in the field of medicine.

7. It is my judgment, after serious discussions with those most intimately involved, that there was no fixed agreed-upon number or approximate number of minority students to be admitted or of persons from any particular ethnic or racial group that either the Admissions Committee or its subcommittee felt compelled to produce...Having said that, I think it should also be said that all of those involved felt that the Program would produce a

> "substantial number" of minority students...Since there was no group discussion of the racial or ethnic composition of the applicants or of the final class, it is difficult if not impossible to ascertain what effect, it any, this general *mind-set* (italics mine) had on decisions about individual students.
>
> It is my conviction that the major difficulty was in the failure of procedures to operate in the way they were intended to operate and in the adoption under the pressure of time and numbers, of inconsistent ad hoc accommodations to this failure. I believe that given the soundness of purpose, the appropriateness of the criteria that were developed and the reasonableness of the theoretical mechanism designed to select students, that a fair and legitimate admissions procedure can be made to function properly by strengthening the identified weaknesses in this year's selection process."

Chancellor Kibbee's report was balanced and constructive and should have re-established confidence in the social value of the Biomedical Program, the dedication and decency of the faculty who were trying to get the Program off the ground, and the willingness of CUNY and the City College administration to correct mistakes that had been made. I wrote to Chancellor Kibbee as soon as I received a copy of his report and told him that:

> "I agree with your recommendations to improve the admissions procedures. Many of them are already being considered and will be implemented over the next several months. I would like to point out, however, we must be very careful in our zeal to overhaul and improve the admissions procedure that we do not denigrate the outstanding job performed by a dedicated group of people who worked under very trying circumstances - not the least of which was the extremely limited amount of time available to interview almost 600 applicants...I would like to point out that the Director of the Center for Biomedical Education, Dr. Alfred Gellhorn, joined the College on January 1, 1974 - too late to organize the interviewing process for the 1974 entering class. He is one of the nation's leading medical educators and should have no difficulty improving and streamlining the interviewing procedures. The appointment of additional full-time biomedical faculty should provide a cadre of experienced interviewers that would also improve the process...It should be noted that no person or group has publicly found fault with the purposes and goals of the Biomedical Program. Only the admission procedure has been

> criticized...As you know, the Biomedical Program is only one component of our attempt to convert City College into a high quality multi-ethnic university that will serve the city with sensitivity and intelligence. In my view, academic excellence is fully consonant with educational service to all the ethnic communities of New York City. As long as I am President, the College will continue to hold to its goals and its promise..."

Chancellor Kibbee's report did not quiet the concerns of the different ethnic groups nor succeed in placing in context the acknowledged flaws in the admissions process. There was an unwillingness to give the College an opportunity to evolve an admissions procedure that could be non-discriminatory and still fulfill the objectives of the Biomedical Program. Unfriendly questions continued to be addressed to the College and the Chancellor: Question:

> "It is the publicly-stated policy of the Biomedical Program that no racial preference is given in the admission process to any group; this assurance is repeated in your report. Nevertheless, we can find no logical explanation for the following set of figures (and then the table on page 27 is given)...Your report observed that "although minority students survived the interview process at a higher rate than Caucasian students, the difference was not so great that it could not reasonably be explained by other considerations. In fact, however, the decline in the percentage of Whites from the interview stage to the final invitation is so sharp as to raise questions of racial preference. Nor can we find an explanation for the acceptance percentages of males and females when compared with the percentages of those who applied...Are we to conclude that the motivation and academic ability of females and minority students exceeded that of White males? Do you have any other explanation that we may have missed in your report?".

(Our answer was that one had to distinguish between academic and non-academic qualifications and that the Funkenstein report had concluded that in existing medical schools women and minority students excelled in non-academic qualifications. The whole point of the City College Biomedical Program was to train primary care physicians committed to serve in the urban community and this objective required a strong emphasis on non-academic qualifications). Question:

> "Were the 112 interviewees (89 of them minority students) with high school averages below 85% all considered within the pool...of those qualified to handle an accelerated program? Are students with averages below 85% really qualified for an intensive program that grants a college degree and a medical degree in as little as six years?"

[Our answer was that the original City College Faculty Senate Resolution had permitted the admission of a small number of "probationary" students and in a genuine sense the admission of a small number of students with academic averages below 85% (six out of approximately 70 students in the 1974 class) with very strong non-academic qualifications was considered at that time to fulfill this mandate.] Question:

> "Did the President know nothing about the unusual circumstances in the final stages of the selection process? Was he told that the master list contained the racial identification of most of the students? Was he aware that some selection teams had, as you reported, 'an exceptionally high ratio of acceptances.'? Did he know that a rank-ordered list of candidates...was developed for each of the four ethnic categories in order to fill the additional places made available by declinations? Did he know that to replace those students who declined the invitation, a de facto quota was instituted under which the new students were invited in the same racial proportion as those who had declined? Do you regard such a ranking by ethnic category as consistent with assurances that no quota was set for any group? Did President Marshak approve of this solution?".

[Our answer was - as stated earlier - that the President was completely unaware of all these details until his June 3 meeting with Professor Baumel and Brown; this information was incorporated into Chancellor Kibbee's June 18 report.]

The above questions were typical of the many hostile and troubled communications directed at Chancellor Kibbee, Mr. Giardino (BHE Chairman), Dr. Gellhorn and myself during the latter part of June and the early part of July 1974. Recognizing that the College's image was being tarnished, I decided to meet personally with representatives of the concerned community organizations either individually or collectively during the summer months of 1974. I emphasized two points at these meetings:

1. that the new Director of the Biomedical Center, Dr. Gellhorn, would design an improved admissions mechanism for the 1975 class which would be more uniform in its operation, extend over a longer period of time and be more clearcut in its application of identical criteria for admission to the Biomedical Program; and
2. that a concerted effort would be made to increase the number of "guaranteed places" to the third-year level of existing medical schools so that some of the unsuccessful 1974 alternates could be admitted into the 1975 class.

These meetings seemed to alleviate the concerns of all organizations except two: the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Italian-American Center for Urban Affairs. After my meeting with representatives of the Anti-Defamation League, I received a letter from the National Director, Benjamin Epstein, that, among other things, called for "redress" as follows:

> "A. The immediate offer of admission into the class entering in September, 1974, to the largest possible number of those qualified applicants who were rejected during the interview stage or later.
>
> B. A guarantee of admission into the 1975 class for those who cannot be accommodated for September, 1974.
>
> C. Re-interview of those who applied for the September, 1974 class and who were disqualified as a result of the previous interview."

In a letter dated August 19, 1974, I replied to Mr. Epstein in some detail but the following passage is important for the later discussion of the biomedical trial:

333

> "...I believe that these rather strong recommendations for redress originate from your conviction that the entire admissions procedure for the September 1974 class was flawed. We cannot accept this evaluation despite the fact that minority students and women fared much better in the final acceptance list. It is well-known that "biosocial" medicine--which defines the nature of the City College program--is more popular with women and minority students than with Caucasian males (see Prof. Funkenstein's article enclosed as Attachment D..."

(I especially call attention to the underlined statement in parentheses about the Funkenstein report - the ADL counsel later denied having seen the Funkenstein report although the report had been received as Attachment D to the August 19, 1974 letter addressed to the National Director of the organization which had retained him!) The Italian-American Center for Urban Affairs joined the ADL in taking an equally hard line by threatening a law suit.

In mid-Fall, I received a telephone call from Mr. Epstein, requesting a meeting in my office. I readily acquiesced (I had continued my correspondence with him and hoped that we could amically resolve the biomedical issue) and inquired whether I should bring legal counsel. He told me that that would be unnecessary and I said that I would invite Dr. Gellhorn to our meeting. (The meeting took place on December 26, 1976.) Dr. Gellhorn and I were therefore taken aback when Mr. Epstein's companions turned out to be two lawyers, one of whom, Victor Herwitz, later was the ADL counsel at the trial. The meeting's message was simple: either immediately admit one of the rejected applicants, Mr. Kenneth Hupart, into the 1974 Biomedical class or face a law suit. Dr. Gellhorn said that it was too late to admit additional students into the 1974 biomedical class for a variety of reasons which he proceeded to explain. I reiterated my belief that we should not deal with individual cases but that we would continue our vigorous negotiations with medical schools to increase the number of "guaranteed places" and then admit some of the unsuccessful 1974 alternates into the 1975 class to make redress for the acknowledged flaws in the College's selection of alternates. Our replies did not satisfy the ADL group and their frosty departure signaled the law suit that was to eventuate several weeks later.

Two suits were actually filed on January 14, 1975 against the defendants: the BHE, City College, myself, Dr. Gellhorn, Chancellor Kibbee and Mr. Giardino. One suit, a class action, was filed in Federal District Court in the Eastern District of New York on behalf of Mr. Kenneth Hupart by the Anti-Defamation League, and the second, also a class action, was filed in Federal District Court in the Southern District on behalf of Messrs. Michael Scognamiglio and Robert Trotta by the Italian-American Center for Urban Affairs. The first suit (the other was similar in substance) charged that the rejection of Kenneth Hupart's application for admission to the Biomedical Program:

> "...was the direct result of the admission policies, practices, and procedures adopted and utilized by the Admissions Committee of the Biomedical Center whereby (a) in making its determination as to which applicants for admission to the class entering in September 1974 were to be accepted or rejected, those applicants who were in the group denominated Minorities, such as Blacks and persons of Hispanic and Asian extraction, were judged on different and lower standards than those applicants...who were not within the group denominated Minorities, and (b) the Admissions Committee adopted and followed policies, practices and procedures, the objective of which was to grant admission to the class entering in September 1974 on the basis of race, color, and ethnic origin so as to substantially reflect the proportion which each such racial or ethnic group bore to the total population in the City of New York."

(As we shall see, certain crucial details of the charges - such as the elimination of the Asian minority - were modified by the time of the trial.) The biomedical trial took place in May 1976 and will be discussed in the next section.

Before turning to the biomedical trial, I should like to recount a curious development which took place within a month or so after the law suits were filed. The American Jewish Congress (AJC) with whose representatives I had met during the Summer of 1974 in order to "clear the air" about the Biomedical Program, filed a report with the New York State Commissioner of Education in which, among other things, I was accused of "a pattern of denial, evasion and dissembling". The AJC report went on to say that:

> "When finally confronted with evidence of racial preference in admissions procedure, President Marshak has glossed over what occurred, and even attempted to justify the discriminatory acts. We have no doubt that if he had acknowledged that discriminatory procedures had been used, and had then negotiated in good faith concerning appropriate corrective action, the lawsuits could have been averted..."

This was a far cry from a letter sent to me by the AJC the previous summer, after I had met with its representatives, from which I quote:

> "the meeting was most helpful and constructive, and did much to clear the air about the Biomedical Program. We believe that this is an important, innovative program and must be encouraged so that it can become a model for similar programs throughout the country. It is for that reason that we have expressed such grave concerns about the allegations that the admissions procedures were not handled in a fair and non-discriminatory manner."

Whatever provoked the change of attitude I shall never know although I suspect - in view of the timing - that it was not unrelated to the lawsuits brought by the other community organizations; however, the point is not to defend myself against a misdirected accusation (such accusations are an occupational hazard for college presidents) but rather to deal with the purpose of the AJC report to the State Commissioner of Education. The report concluded its citation of grievances, - chiefly against me - by calling upon the State Commissioner of Education:

> "to use his powers under Section 313 of the State Education Law to conduct an investigation of the admissions procedure used for the September 1974 entering class of the City College Biomedical program..."

The report further urged:

> "the Commissioner of Education to review the proposed 1975 admissions procedure for the Biomedical program to insure the non-discriminatory nature of that procedure. Through such actions, the Commissioner of Education will be able to restore confidence in the community and among prospective applicants that admission to the Biomedical Program at City College is both fair and non-discriminatory".

The Commissioner responded to this complaint and accordingly conducted a complete review of the 1975 recruitment and selection process used by the Admissions Committee for the Biomedical Program. The special review included interviews with appropriate City College officials, an analysis of established admissions procedures, and an assessment of the procedures that were actually implemented. By early Fall of 1975, the Commissioner had concluded his special investigation of "alleged discrimination in admissions practices in City College's Biomedical Program" and found "the institution not guilty of any acts of discrimination in its 1975 selection practices"; the Commissioner further stated that:

> "the admissions process used was one of the most objective systems in medical school admissions ... even the interview process, which could introduce an element of bias, was structured carefully and the interviewers were trained in advance."

It should be noted that the Commissioner refrained from investigating complaints of discrimination in admissions to the 1974 class because these were the subject of suits in the courts.

One other development occurred during the Spring of 1975 that added to the irony and injustice I saw in the biomedical trial a year later. This was Dr. Gellhorn's success in acquiring some additional "guaranteed places" from several more medical schools so that the promised redress could be made for the faulty process in selecting alternates for the 1974 Biomedical class. The then City College Provost, Egon Brenner, was given "carte blanche" by me to come up with the top dozen or so names from the pool of "Accepts" and "Holds" who had been passed over for admission to the 1974 class. Provost Brenner chose to use the newly-developed computerized admissions procedures that had been employed to select the 1975 Biomedical class and that so highly praised by the State Commissioner of Education a few months later. Ten alternate applicants for the 1974 class were invited into the 1975 class; six accepted. And so the College fulfilled its second major commitment made during the Summer of 1974: in addition to improving its admissions procedures, the College had made reasonable redress for the flaws uncovered during the last stages of the 1974 admissions process. I hoped this would settle the matter but it did not; the Anti-Defamation League and the Italian-American Center for Urban Problems were not placated because their particular student-clients were not included in the list of ten invitees (e.g. Mr. Hupart actually placed 25th after re-evaluation in accordance with the 1975 admissions guidelines).

And so on to the biomedical trial.

§4 The Biomedical Trial

The biomedical trial began on May 10, 1976 in the Federal Court, Southern District of New York, before Justice Marvin Frankel, after the two plaintiffs - the Anti-Defamation League and the Italian-American Center for Urban Problems - consolidated their suits. The trial lasted five days and generated close to 1000 pages of testimony. Judge Frankel's decision was rendered on August 17, 1976 and the first section on "Findings of Act" concluded, in sum, that:

"plaintiffs had proven that:

(1) 19 Asians and Caucasians were intentionally eliminated on the basis of race during the selection of the orignal 79 invitees;

(2) discrimination solely on the basis of race was practiced in the selection of the 14 alternates; and

(3) a 50% quota for Blacks and Hispanics was a desired goal of the Subcommittee in making its selections.".

The second section on "Conclusions of Law" ended with the statement:

> "In view of the complexities flowing from the bifurcation of this action, the court will wait guidance from the parties as to (a) what order, if any, should now be entered to reflect the court's conclusion that the defendants committed intentional racial discrimination in violation of the Constitution in connection with the 1974 admissions process to the Biomedical Program, and (b) how to proceed from here to the second stage of trial.".

The reference to "bifuraction of the trial" reflected Judge Frankel's decision that the trial would take place in two parts: the first part to establish whether quotas had been used and reverse discrimination practiced in selecting the 1974 biomedical class and the second part to decide on damages if the decision in the first part were positive.

Before commenting on Judge Frankel's key findings, I should remind the reader that an intense national debate over the meaning of "affirmative action" was taking place throughout the country during this period and was being fought in a number of courts. Just one month before the Frankel decision, for example, the U.S. District Court ruled that the policy of Georgetown University to set aside 60% of its first-year law school scholarships for minority applicants was a violation of the Civil Rights Act. A U.S. district judge in Virginia had ruled in favor of a plaintiff who claimed that an affirmative action program under which Virginia Commonwealth University attempted to recruit women was discriminatory. The famous case of Marco DeFunis Jr., who sued the University of Washington over its denial to admit him to its law school, had failed to provide the nation with a precedent when the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review a lower court ruling that upheld the university's right to deny admission to Mr. DeFunis. The case of Allan Bakke, the applicant to the University of California at Davis' medical school had not yet been decided by the Supreme Court.

Hindsight can be a depressing experience and I must confess that when I reconstruct the preparation for the biomedical trial and the conduct of the trial itself, I am dismayed by the ineptness of our defense and disappointed by the Court's appearing to succumb to the legal maneuvers of plaintiff's counsel. I make the last statement in the light of Judge Frankel's moving article published in The New York Times Magazine only 18 months after the biomedical trial. In that article, Judge Frankel wrote:

> "We all know that a lawyer's relative talents either make a critical difference or are so likely to make it that we would not

> risk the sacrifice of the possible advantage promised by superior counsel. That leaves the sacrifice to be made by those who have no choice, the less-well-heeled. In other words, though the point can't be quantified, money buys better odds in the contest for justice. And that, on ancient principle, is not wholly agreeable."

To fulfill the promise of equal justice under law for all, which is the birthright of all Americans, Judge Frankel suggested the creation of a

> "...National Legal Service that will make the assistance of lawyers freely and equally available to all, without regard to ability to pay, as a public service..."

Somehow, these precepts were not in evidence during the Biomedical Trial a year and one-half earlier!

It is now my obligation to explain the reasons for my dismay and disappointment and then go into a more systematic critique of Judge Frankel's decision. City College, legally, is a creature of the BHE (now the Board of Trustees) and its legal affairs are handled by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs located at CUNY Central, except when there is a court trial. When a trial is in the offing, CUNY, as a quasi-agency of New York City, falls under the jurisdiction of the Office of Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, an office so deplorably understaffed and underbudgeted that it has been more than once the sympathetic subject of various news stories. When the biomedical suit was instituted, a young attorney in the Corporation Counsel's Office was assigned to the case who seemed to me no match for the well-paid veteran trial lawyer, Victor Herwitz, who had been retained as the chief counsel for the plaintiff. (Mr. Herwitz was one of the two attorneys who, with the Director of the Anti-Defamation League, met with Dr. Gellhorn and me back in the Fall of 1974.) The disparity between the experience of defense counsel and plaintiff's counsel seemed obvious at the trial. This view is supported by the fact that Judge Frankel rather consistently sustained the objections of plaintiff's Counsel and overruled those of defense Counsel.

Some details will give further substance to my impressions. Shortly before the trial began, the attorney assigned to City College by Corporation Counsel's Office, phoned me for an appointment in order to prepare for the trial. The preparation consisted of my responding to a series of specific questions posed by the attorney. I discovered at the trial, however, that defense counsel seemed not have have been fully acquainted with the basic documents, correspondence and materials bearing on the case. One example cited at some length pinpoints the various problems that faced the defendants. The Funkenstein report of 1971 - which I discussed in the previous section - provided evidence for the concept of preferential interest in "biosocial" medicine on the part of minority students and women in existing medical schools. It was, in many ways, the key to the design of the City College Biomedical Program and its admissions policy. I had frequently mentioned the Funkenstein report in writing about the Biomedical Program and, in particular, had singled out this report in my August 19, 1974 letter to Mr. Epstein, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League (see my quotation from this letter in §3). It is inconceivable to me that Mr. Herwitz had not seen my letter to Mr. Epstein and this view seems to be confirmed by plaintiff's counsel's sharp reaction to my reference to this report at the trial (see below). Defense counsel only belatedly appreciated the significance of the Funkenstein report for the outcome of the trial. I am convinced that Judge Frankel's decision would have been quite different if he had permitted himself the opportunity to study the Funkenstein report.

These opinions are supported by the exchange on the witness stand in the matter of the Funkenstein report; I shall give verbatim excerpts from the trial testimony and insert my commentary between brackets as I go along. The trial lasted five days, Monday thru Friday, May 10-14, 1976. I was called to testify on the second day and, on direct examination, Mr. Herwitz started off my asking me a fairly general question (Q stands for question, A stands for answer):

Q "In your own words, tell the Judge, Judge Frankel, whatever you think is pertinent; you have been here yesterday and today, you are familiar with this lawsuit, as to the origin of the Center, its objectives and whatever you know about the admission practices, for the class entering in 1974."

After some introductory remarks, I went on:

A "One of the responsibilities I had was to try to make Open Admissions as successful as possible. However, I thought that in order to continue the distinguished tradition of City College, which had done so much for the city and this nation in terms of turning out graduates,...that this great institution had to receive reinvigoration from certain types of programs in addition to discharging its responsibility for Open Admissions. And I came upon some thoughts which have been published, my first Biennial report. I don't know what to do about exhibits, but I talked about the problems and prospects of an urban university--"

Q "Doctor, if you have papers there that you want to offer in evidence we can mark them all now and then you can continue...

Q What else, Dr. Marshak?

A Well, the Urban Educational Model (handing)...

A in that report I tried to explain the educational strategies that I thought one should try to develop at the City College, to convert it into one of the leading urban universities in the country, which would not only reconcile equal educational opportunity and academic excellence but actually enable them to reinforce each other. As part of this educational strategy it seemed to me desirable to introduce a series of programs at the College-to the extent that I could persuade the Faculty to do so -- that would not only serve important societal needs but also have a mission commensurate with the multi-ethnic student body that we have...

Well, the first program that was introduced under this rubric was this Biomedical Program...

The original benefactor, who still prefers to remain anonymous, decided to give this gift to the college for the first three years of operating expenses of the program, and put into his agreement the following statement, that the objectives of this program will be to provide students with a faster entry and movement through medical school and to encourage and motivate minority students to enter medical careers, so as to provide urban inner city areas with more devoted physicians and other health professionals...

Now what is the meaning of these conditions? I think this is the cause of some of the problems and misapprehensions and misunderstanding.

The model that we were trying to develop at the City College had several facets. First, it was an accelerated program...

I added one very important component -- I claim originality for that part -- the first part was not my basic concept -- what I added was the emphasis on primary health care, and I did that for several reasons:

First, I learned through various reports that primary health care was being neglected in this country. I thought therefore that we would choose a particular emphasis, which the bulk of the medical schools were not choosing, and that would give our program a certain uniqueness. Secondly, and very importantly to me, was that by choosing the primary health care emphasis, the logical consequence would be to open up the criteria for admission, with primary emphasis on the academic end, to a multiple set of criteria which involved such things as maturity, interest in people, social commitment, and so on. This seemed to me to be desirable for the reason mentioned earlier, that I was president of a multi-ethnic institution and I should try, whereever possible, to initiate programs that would be hospitable to both women and minority students. The basis for that judgment in this case was an article by Professor Funkenstein of the Harvard Medical School, which studied the interests of women and minority students compared to majority males..."

Q May I interrupt you. Do you have a copy of that?

A I don't have it here but it can be provided.

MR. HERWITZ: Does Defense Counsel have a copy? And if they do not have a copy of it, I have never seen it. I have not heard it mentioned. I do not think Dr. Marshak should be permitted to testify about a report that I have never seen or heard of.

THE WITNESS: Well, I am testifying to the influence it had on me, -- I'm sorry I don't mean to quarrel with you. I am ready to provide that copy for you.

MR. HERWITZ: Well, what is in a report, which apparently is a substantial basis for the defense in this case -- one that I have never seen, and I do not know how it was made. I object to it.

THE COURT: Defense Counsel, do you have it?

DEFENSE COUNSEL: I don't have it here, and I am not certain -- as I understand it, Dr. Funkenstein has written several reports, and I don't know exactly which one Dr. Marshak is referring to. I think it can be obtained and I think it can be admitted.

THE WITNESS: It is in my files.

THE COURT: Is that agreeable with you, Mr. Herwitz?

MR. HERWITZ: No, sir.

THE COURT: It is not.

MR. HERWITZ: No, sir.

THE COURT: That is, if they bring it here. The only problem is we might have to bring you back, Dr. Marshak.

No, I think I will sustain the objection. I won't hear testimony about it.

Bring it in and then if you want to bring Dr. Marshak back, you can talk about it then.

[I interject my first comment: it is interesting that plaintiff's counsel had no problem with my entering into the record my bulky Biennial Report and the brochure on the Urban Educational Model but immediately resisted the introduction into the record of the Funkenstein report (no larger than the brochure). Especially noteworthy was Mr. Herwitz's change of tone and his sudden aggressiveness (after all, the trial was scheduled for three more days and there would have been plenty of time to examine the Funkenstein report). Defense counsel also did not help matters by showing initial confusion about the number of Funkenstein reports (there was only one!). Finally, the Court at first seemed inclined to allow the Funkenstein report into the record but then inexplicably, to me, pulled back.]

The testimony now took a queer turn:

DEFENSE COUNSEL: I think Dr. Marshak can testify without reference to that report.
THE COURT: Yes, that is what I was suggesting.

A Well, let me say that there is information available in the literature which indicates that women and minority students tend to move into areas of community medicine, family medicine, psychiatry and areas of that sort more than the majority males.
MR. HERWITZ: I move to strike out that statement.
THE COURT: Yes, I will strike it out.
Dr. Marshak, we do have some rules, and you just cannot tell us what is in literature. It has to come in according to some evidentiary requirements that we have. So I will disregard that.

[Defense counsel was trying to be helpful but could not cope with Mr. Herwitz's technical prowess. The Court supported Mr. Herwitz and suddenly rebuked me after seeming to support the new line of questioning by defense counsel. After that rebuke, I felt that the rest of my testimony that day would be disregarded. This downcast feeling was confirmed for me by the final exchange with defense counsel on that day.]

Q "Dr. Marshak, you stated that one of the factors that you considered in deciding that the selection of the original 79 admitees

or invitees to the Program were not racially selected but that the statistical -- the acceptance rate for minorities did not surprise you because it was consistent with what you would expect it to be.
Could you explain --

MR. HERWITZ: Objection, leading.

THE COURT: Well, you are leading somewhat more than we do with college presidents usually.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: I have no further questions.

[Defense counsel was heroicly trying to get into the record the reasons why I had not been perturbed by the ethnic and sex distribution of the original 79 invitees to the Biomedical Program but between the objection of Mr. Herwitz and the "humor" of the Court, defense counsel gave up on this point.]

On thinking over the frustrations encountered during my testimony on the second day of the trial, I decided to express my concerns to defense counsel and to the CUNY Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (with whom I had a cordial relationship but who was only playing a consultative role at this trial). As a result of our meeting, I was called back as a witness during the last day of the trial in order to try to get the Funkenstein report into the record for the Court's consideration, or at least to communicate some sense of its essential findings that had contributed so much to defining the character of the City College Biomedical Program. Defense counsel now led the questioning:

Q "Can you tell us what your motivation was in setting up the program?

A My motivation in setting up the program was to satisfy what I considered to be an important societal need --

MR. HERWITZ: I object.

THE COURT: I really am a little disturbed. I don't stick in the bark of procedure, but at the end of the week, to recall a witness back to box I, I don't think that is Mr. Herwitz's objection, but it is my objection, is a very dubious way to proceed.

I have heard a lot about motivation and minorities, and so on. I don't think you ought to do this.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Perhaps I can enlist your aid, your Honor, in giving me some direction.

Dr. Marshak's state of mind with respect to setting up this program was in large part because he had...the Funkenstein report. At that time, when Dr. Marshak was testifying about that report, I believe Mr. Herwitz said, "I'd like to see a copy of that report."

On a subsequent date I offered to produce a copy of that report into evidence and Mr. Herwitz objected and I think you upheld that objection.

I would like to make an offer of proof with respect to the Funkenstein report, because I think it is critical to understanding what Dr. Marshak's state of mind was.

THE COURT: Make an offer of proof.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: I would like to offer into evidence a report entitled "Advising Minority Group Students" --

THE COURT: What is it going to show?

DEFENSE COUNSEL: It is going to show that the likelihood of minorities and women to enter the field of primary care medicine is a reasonable likelihood.

Consequently, when one finds statistics that show that in fact minorities and women did appear to receive preferences, that was not because of racial motivation and it was not because it was racially biased, it was because this could be expected based on certain characteristics of these groups of students who applied to medical school and what their interests are.

MR. HERWITZ: May I be heard?

THE COURT: No, I am not going to admit it, but I don't want to hear about that. That is a subject for expert testimony.

DEFENSE COUSEL: No, your Honor, but it is relevant to what Dr. Marshak thought--

THE COURT: I don't care what he thought. You have just made your offer of proof, and your offer of proof was quite separate from what he thought. It was supposed to show possibilities for the racial balance of this class.

If your offer of proof is something else or if I misunderstood it, tell me.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Perhaps I can try again to clarify it. The suggestion has been that Dr. Marshak, upon looking at the evidence, the number, the statistics, that these statistics should have raised in his mind such doubt that the procedures that had occurred previously were racially infected and racially biased that he ought to have done something on the basis of the numbers that he found.

My argument is that these numbers should not have raised any doubts in his mind that anything improper had occurred; in fact, the numbers should have been consistent with what he expected to find, and his expectations were based upon the Funkenstein report.

MR. HERWITZ: May I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes. That sounds plausible.

MR. HERWITZ: Your Honor, the existence of this Funkenstein report has been apparently known to the defendants from the start of this litigation, because it's been quoted to us heretofore. They now claim it is a very material part of their case. But when it came to drawing up a pretrial order and listing all the authorities that their expert was going to rely on and all the exhibits that they were going to offer, significantly this was not one of them.

THE COURT: Why wasn't it one of them; if it played such a big part of his thinking on such a central issue in this case?...

DEFENSE COUNSEL: I am not offering it in connection with expertise. There has been substantial doubt raised about whether Dr. Marshak has acted properly, in view of certain facts that came to his knowledge. Shouldn't this have raised an inference? Shouldn't this have caused him to move?

THE COURT: Would you address my question?

Doubt was raised about this a couple of years ago. He was sued. And the question that has been put to you is, why didn't you notice this exhibit in the pretrial order when you listed a lot of other things? And I would like you to answer that; because under our rules I frequently do not allow exhibits, especially fat ones, that have not been noticed. Why didn't you notice it?

DEFENSE COUNSE: I really --

THE WITNESS: Just one paragraph.

THE COURT: It is excluded.

VICE CHANCELLOR FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS: I am counsel to the Board of Higher Education.

Defendent Robert Marshak is here in his personal capacity. He is being sued as an individual as well as a representative of the Board of Higher Education. This is an important piece of evidence. Insofar as it was not done pursuant to the rules, pretrial rules that you may have, pursuant to which something may or may not be excluded, we apologize.

But the defendant feels, and I believe rightly so in this instance, that he is deprived of his opportunity to defend himself. There are many things I would like to say.

There have been allegations here that they have covered up, his integrity has been brought into question here. He has every right and indeed, he has the responsibility to bring before this Court those pieces of evidence that are -- were important in his mind and that in fact influenced his behavior with respect to the facts in issue in this case.

I would ask you to reconsider and to permit him the breadth of testimony that you have permitted to the plaintiff in this case; I think for good reason. I think we want all the facts here and the mere fact that there was a procedural flaw in this voluminous case at the beginning, should not be permitted to interfere with very substantial due process right of defendant, who may incur personal liability in this matter.

MR. HERWITZ: May I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HERWITZ: At the urgent request of defense counsel in the course of the pretrial proceedings, I reluctantly agreed not to bother either Chancellor Kibbee or Dr. Marshak, and I did not examine them in pretrial, at their request.

To come on the last day of the trial and to put in something which they think is so important as a question of due process, I respectfully submit is a denial to the plaintiffs of due process. As I said, I don't know what is in this report. But we certainly haven't had a chance to test whatever it is supposed to prove. I don't know who Dr. Funkenstein is. We have had no opportunity and would not have had any opportunity to perhaps go up and interview him, find out the basis of whatever he is supposed to have said.

I respectfully submit that under the circumstances, not just for technical reasons, your Honor, or compliance with the rules, that to permit this document in evidence is unfair to the plaintiffs.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: I would like to contradict some statement that was made by Mr. Herwitz.

Mr. Herwitz did not fail to depose anyone at my urgent request. I would think that my urgent request to Mr. Herwitz would be almost irrelevant. We did ask him to depose others first with personal knowledge, and after deposing those people with personal knowledge, then I requested that he make a decision at that time whether he wished to depose President Marshak and Chancellor Kibbee. That is what he agreed to. And that was what my request was.

In addition, with respect to the Funkenstein report, as he says, that has been mentioned in this case and in our conversations at length in detail and very frequently. So for him to suggest at this point that this comes as a shock to him, he never knew about it and didn't have an opportunity to investigate about it, his statements belie that.

THE COURT: The subject is fascinating, we could go on with it forever..."

[The excerpts from my testimony during the last day of the trial buttress my earlier feelings about the defendents' case. The question remains in my mind - when should the Bench instruct counsel in an effort to compensate for an unequal legal match caused by the prevailing conditions in the American legal system, a problem exposed so eloquently in Judge Frankel's own article in The New York Times Magazine.]

Let us recall that there were 1000 pages of testimony and that the "Funkenstein" exchange was only a miniscule part of this testimony. However, it typified Mr. Herwitz's ability to convince the Court to make rulings that undermined the defendants' case. I cite several other examples. To start with, the suit was a class action and

350

Judge Frankel permitted a change in wording of the suit from:

> "Caucasian applicants to the Biomedical Program (for the class entering in September, 1974) who...were denied admission to such Program solely because they were Caucasian, but for which fact they would have been admitted..." to "all persons denied admission on account of race".

This decision to broaden the complaint was helpful to the plaintiffs because the later effort of defense counsel to disprove Baumel's critical allegation that only Caucasian males were eliminated in the selection of the first 79 invitees might have led Judge Frankel to a contrary conclusion. Changing the definition of class was compounded by Judge Frankel's further decision that Asians should be counted together with Caucasians, contrary to all the existing records at the College, Federal affirmative action guidelines, and the consistency in the attitudes and behavior of the College. The Faculty Senate minutes (referred to in the trial) confirm that minorities were defined by the College and in my statements in accordance with HEW guidelines, namely Blacks, Asians, Hispanic and American Indians. A letter from the General Counsel of the Anti-Defamation League, the chief plaintiff, accepted this definition in one of the trial exhibits. But Judge Frankel, in a footnote to his Decision, tried to bolster this contrary opinion by stating that City College did not have an Asian community relations person, when in fact it did have such a person. If the Asian students had been counted together with the Black and Hispanic students, the number of "minority" students would have exceeded the number of "majority" students in the 1974 Biomedical class and there would not have been the spurious numerology of a 50/50 split with its mischievous intimation of "quotas".

A third decision of Judge Frankel proved harmful to our side, namely the bifurcation of the trial and his rulings subsequent to that decision. Judge Frankel ruled that the testimony had to be confined to the proximate time of the selection of the 1974 biomedical class and could not refer to events that transpired a year later. This decision prevented our counsel from placing into the record the fact that the State Commission of Education had fully investigated the 1975 admissions procedures, found them to be completely satisfactory (indeed, "one of the most objective systems in medical school admissions"). Most significantly, the redress carried out during 1975 for ten aggrieved students of the previous year, on the basis of these approved admissions procedures, did not include Messrs Hupart, Scognamiglio and Trotta. These are three further decisions made by Judge Frankel that were unfavorable to our side but I believe they communicate a sense of the handicaps under which the defendants labored at the biomedical trial.

With these rulings in our disfavor and the Court's decision to withhold from the record a document (the Funkenstein report) basic to the genesis of the Biomedical Program, it is understandable that Judge Frankel failed to discern the guiding principles of the program. In my opinion, this accounts for the flaws in his "Findings of Fact". With the background material given in §3 (and I used quotes liberally in order to validate the source), I will demonstrate some of these flaws in Judge Frankel's argumentation. His Finding 1 was: "19 Asians and Caucasians were intentionally eliminated on the basis of race during the selection of the original 79 invitees".

To reach this finding, Judge Frankel seemed to rely on Professor Baumel's worksheet (which had served as a basic document for the Subcommittee's deliberations on the night of March 28 inasmuch as neither Professor Brown, Dr. Henderson nor Ms. Sanchez had worksheets). The only other worksheets - those of Mr. William DiBrienza (the Associate Registrar) and of Dr. Gellhorn - were not turned over to the Subcommittee (according to testimony at the trial). The Judge, although correctly focusing on the worksheet actually used by the Subcommittee, drew, in my view, a conclusion that did not fit the totality of evidence. Baumel's worksheet showed that 96 students were on the list of "Accepts" (or "Yesses") and that 21 were eliminated [14 Caucasians, 5 Asians and 2 Hispanics (or Latins")] whereas both DiBrienza's worksheet and Dr. Gellhorn's worksheet contained only 94 "Yesses", with the 2 Latins listed as "Holds". Noting this discrepancy, Judge Frankel argued (in footnote 23 of his Decision):

> "the notations for these two on Baumel's worksheet appeared as follows:
>
> ~~Hold~~ Yes
> ~~Hold~~ Yes
>
> The "Yesses" would seem to have been added at a later time. In light of that, Professor Baumel's concession at his deposition that '94' was probably the correct figure, and the agreement between the Gellhorn and DiBrienza worksheets, the court finds that the two Latins were never full committee 'Yesses'.".

In my view, there were deficiencies in the court's reasoning that invalidate this key finding in its Decision: (i) Since all testimony at the trial indicated that neither DiBrienza's worksheet nor Dr. Gellhorn's worksheet was ever turned over to the Subcommittee and

and that the Subcommittee's decisions were never placed before the full Admissions Committee for its review, Baumel's worksheet must have been the basic document for the reduction in the list of "Yesses". (ii) Baumel's "concession at his deposition that 94 was probably the correct figure" cannot, it seems to me, be given as much weight as the statement in my June 6, 1974 letter to Chancellor Kibbee. Judge Frankel noted, in a footnote to his Decision, that the June 6 letter to the Chancellor had been drafted exclusively by Baumel; in actual fact, both Baumel and Brown drafted the letter, basing it on our June 3, 1974 "wrapup" meeting. In any case, this June 6 letter makes two important statements: "the original 247 applicants were narrowed down to 94 (or 96)* "Yesses" and "The ethnic distribution of the eliminated 'Yesses' was as follows: 14 Caucasians, 2 Latins**, 5 Asians". It would be more plausible to accept Baumel's recollection of the evening's events, as recorded in the June 6 letter (Professor Baumel acknowledged at the trial that he had a poor memory) than to give weight to the "concession at his deposition that 94 was probably the correct figure" taken a year later. The June 6

---

*In my June 6 letter, the * was a footnote with the following explanation: "The Associate Registrar of the College records 94 and 27; the Admissions Committee Chairman of the Biomedical Program records 96".

**In my June 6 letter, the ** was a footnote with the explanation "these were the 27 on the Associate Registrar's records".

letter also casts doubt on Judge Frankel's conjecture that "the 'Yesses' (for the 2 Latins on Baumel's worksheet) would seem to have been added at a later time". (iii) The part of Judge Frankel's decision I find hardest to understand was his failure to record in his "Findings of Fact" that the Subcommittee had transferred 4 students from the "Hold category to the final listof 79 invitees, of whom 2 were Caucasian males. Why should the Subcommittee take the trouble, in the middle of the night, to add 2 Caucasian males from the "Hold" category (and thereby require the elimination of 2 more Caucasian males from the "Yesses" category) unless one accepts Baumel's testimony that "candidates were rejected primarily for lack of commitment to urban medicine" (this quotation is taken from page 15 of Judge Frankel's Decision). Judge Frankel does state in his "Findings of Fact" (page 15 of his Decision) that:

> "the subcommittee retired to an apartment with the file folders of the candidates who had been placed in the Yes and two Hold categories. Most, but not all, of the folders were read again; several of the Holds were specifically signaled out by Professor Brown for the Subcommittee's attention based on his recollection that either he or some other committee member had queried their placement in Hold rather than Yes".

But the Findings fails to note that 4 students from the "Hold" list were on the final list of invitees and that 2 of them were Caucasian males. Why this omission? Judge Frankel did present his rationale for deleting the two "Latins" from the list of 'Yesses' based on Baumel's worksheet (after eliminating Asians from the minority category on the mistaken supposition that "the College had special representatives to the Black and Hispanic but not Asian communities"). From this he concluded that no minorities were eliminated from the original ist of 'Yesses'.

I can only wonder why Judge Frankel did not take into account the unusual support for Caucasian males on the part of the Subcommittee when it scrutinized the "Hold" applications.

I reiterate my contention that Judge Frankel's Finding 1) was not justified by the evidence. My view, I think, would have been upheld on Appeal, especially if the Funkenstein report were admitted into evidence. In my judgment, Judge Frankel's position concerning the category in which Asians were counted, as well as his decision not to allow consideration of the State Commissioner of Education's 1975 investigation of the biomedical admissions procedure, would also have been reversed on Appeal.

Finding 2: "discrimination solely on the basis of race was practiced in the selection of the 14 alternates" is hardly surprising, although one might question its precise wording. After all, I was the first administrative official not involved in the admissions process to learn - at the June 3, 1974 meeting with Baumel and Brown - that the alternate list for the 1974 Biomedical class had been selected from four "rank-ordered" ethnic lists. My knowledge of the situation was reflected in my June 6 letter to the Chancellor and used in his June 18 Report. I was frank and open about this "contamination" of the Admission's process with the press and with representatives of various community organizations with whom I met during the Summer of 1974, six months before the biomedical suit was started. It was this failure in the Admissions process that led the College to proceed with the restitution process in the late Spring of

1975 -- after a sufficient number of medical school guarantees had been obtained. Since there was no a priori way to predict the percentages of declinations in the ethnic categories, the Subcommittee's action did not, strictly speaking, involve "reverse discrimination". But there is no question that the Subcommittee used ethnic considerations in the selection of alternates to the 1974 Biomedical class. Some attorneys have since told me that the Subcommittee's action in 1974 could now be judged legal under the Supreme Court decision on the Bakke case, which prohibits the use of "quotas" but permits "partial considerations of race". However, in my opinion, it would be counterproductive for the City College Biomedical Program to implement the College's "affirmative action" policy in this way.

It is Judge Frankel's Finding 3: "a 50% quota for Blacks and Hispanics was a desired goal of the Subcommittee in makings its selections" that is truly amazing to me. This finding seems to disregard such evidence as: the rejection by the 1974 Biomedical Admissions Committee (recorded in its Minutes) of such a recommendation by the Community Advisory Committee; the written denial of any "quotas" by a faculty member (Professor Shevlin) who served on the 1974 Admissions Committee; and the denial in sworn testimony by Professors Baumel and Brown of this allegation when confronted with it by the plaintiff's attorney (in Judge Frankel's own words, on page 15 of his Decision: "Professors Brown and Baumel did the lion's share of the work in the Subcommittee").

Even if one accepts Judge Frankel's grouping of Asians and Caucasians, there is the question of drawing conclusions based on the separate actions of the full Admissions Committee and the Subcommittee. After receiving the material and confused instructions from the full Committee at 10 P.M. on March 28, the Subcommittee developed the initial list of acceptances during the early hours of the morning of March 29 in one way, selected the first group of alternates in a completely different way, and picked the final group of alternates in yet a third way. To believe that the Subcommittee could predict the numbers of final acceptances from the Asian-Caucasian and Black-Hispanic ethnic groups in order to achieve a 50-50 distribution goal was to read a great deal into the Subcommittee's somewhat erratic course of action. (It is curious that Judge Frankel does not find a 50-50 sex quota in the Black and Hispanic students admitted to the program since the final numbers were 18 males and 18 females - see table on page 327.)

Since I am not a lawyer, I can not authoritatively critique the section of the Decision entitled "Conclusions of Law". Nevertheless, I did puzzle over several statements in this section. For example:

> "Defendants' answer asserts that plaintiffs' action is barred because they failed first to take their complaints to the Commissioner of Education pursuant to N.Y. Educ. Law §313 (5). This defense was not raised in defendants' trial or post-trial memorandum. Assuming that the defense had not been abandoned, it is now rejected on the merits..."

As mentioned earlier, Judge Frankel's decision to have a bifurcated trial did not permit the introduction of evidence that the State Commissioner of Education had approved the 1975 admissions procedures with very high marks. Why then raise the issue of an investigation by the Commissioner of Education? Another example:

> "When this case began, it appeared that the so-called 'reverse discrimination' that was alleged might be the occasion for deciding the interesting and difficult constitutional questions left open by the Supreme Court in DeFunis v. Odegaard, supra. And there were insinuations along the way that special concerns of cultural understanding and physician-patient rapport might support special preferences for minority applicants for programs of training to practice urban medicine. But as the case developed, it became apparent that the legal task was simpler and clearer...As the record now stands, the State, as represented by these defendants, rejects race as a proper admission criterion, even in a program with objectives that might arguably justify its use. There is, then, no basis for the distinctions that were made by the State's agents on the basis of race."

Judge Frankel, in not allowing the Funkenstein report to be inserted into the record, cut himself off from the basic rationale of the City College Biomedical Program which, succinctly put, was to achieve socially desirable goals without quotas and reverse discrimination. The error uncovered in the very last phase of the 1974 biomedical admissions process was an aberration. The Biomedical Program's original expectation was that minority students and women would self-select themselves in greater proportions than would White males for a program emphasizing primary care medicine if proper weight was given to non-academic qualifications. Judge Frankel could have sat in judgment over a precedent-making trial contributing to social progress if he had permitted the introduction of the significant documents defining the Biomedical Program instead of concentrating on the human errors that accompany any new venture.

After Judge Frankel's Decision was announced on August 17, 1976, I made a valiant try for an appeal but was beaten back. Briefly, what happened was that shortly after the trial ended, Judge Frankel notified the attorneys for both sides that independent of his decision concerning the first part of the bifurcated trial, he hoped that the second part of the trial would not be necessary. The implication was that gestures of good will were in order on both sides. As Judge Frankel noted in his August 17 decision (page 26):

> "On June 30, 1976, the defendants, without admitting that any discrimination had occurred during the first Subcommittee meeting, extended invitations to the Program to the 12 full Committee "Yesses" who had been eliminated and not offered admission at any later time".

I do not recall any comparable movement on the other side after the first part of the trial ended.

When the August 17 Decision concerning the biomedical trial was announced, I was so disturbed by the court's negative findings, that I immediately read through the thousand pages of trial testimony and other relevant documents and prepared a written critique. I then contacted a distinguished jurist, also a City College alumnus, and asked him to recommend an attorney specializing in Civil Rights cases. I met with this attorney, shared my critique with him, and asked him if he would agree to serve as personal counsel to Dr. Gellhorn and myself (since it was evident that Dr. Gellhorn and I had the greatest personal stake in the outcome.) The attorney agreed and, as I recall, encouraged me to think that he might be able to induce the Corporation Counsel to undertake an appeal. I then proceeded to inform the Office of Corporation Counsel that Dr. Gellhorn and I had retained personal counsel who would work on a consultant basis with that office. I was told by the Corporation Counsel's office that if Dr. Gellhorn and I retained private counsel, not only would we be compelled to pay counsel's fees out of our own pockets but that we could also expect to pay the damages as well!

An old Russian proverb says, "If there is no apple, one eats a little carrot." So, instead of retaining counsel, I sent my critique to the Corporation Counsel. Dr. Gellhorn and I met with him and his associates to urge an appeal, and we settled for another Russian proverb, "The future belongs to him who knows how to wait."

Russian proverbs aside, the Office of Corporation Counsel decided not to reopen the case and a settlement was finally worked out. We insisted on this language:

> "Although the defendants do not concede the correctness of the plaintiffs' allegations or the Court's decision herein dated August 17, 1976, they are constrained because of that decision to stipulate solely, for the purpose of settling this action, that it be declared pursuant to that decision that the plaintiffs were subjected to intentional racial discrimination in violation of the United States Constitution in connection with the 1974 admissions process to the Program."

City University agreed to pay the legal fees of the plaintiffs' attorney (approximately $75,000) and also $1,500 per student (about a half dozen in number) who belonged to the class of "aggrieved" students, i.e. those who were on the original list of "Yesses" and were not admitted to the 1974 Biomedical class by the Subcommittee and also not given redress either June 1975 (Restitution I) nor June 1976 (Restitution II). Incidently, Meesrs. Hupart and Scognamiglio were enrolled in the 1976 biomedical class at City College, resigning as juniors respectively from Columbia and M.I.T. Quite a tribute to the City College Biomedical Program!

§5 Aftermath of the Biomedical Trial

I should like to conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of the aftermath of the biomedical trial. The adverse decision of the Court had very little long range impact on the fortunes of the Biomedical Program. There was, of course, a short-range harmful effect. When the attorneys for the plaintiffs hailed Judge Frankel's decision as "the country's first successful reverse-discrimination suit in the field of education", the statement was bound to alienate some alumni and friends of the College. An alumnus who was a senior scientist in one of the industrial laboratories had this to say:

> "Shall we prevent the training of the best possible doctors, solely because they are not Black or Hispanic? There can be but one intelligent answer to these 'heart-of-the-matter' type questions, and that is an outright rejection of the entire quota system and reverse discrimination programs in toto. Might I urge you all to consider what you are trying to do to my alma mater, how you are trying to subjugate the best of your potential students. And you are doing all of these insane things for the sake of appeasing minorities by destroying the rights of still other minorities. Shall we never learn from history that such an approach is at the outset doomed to defeat?"

Another alumnus, writing an analysis of the Frankel decision for the magazine of the City College Alumni Association, concluded his article with the statement:

> "Self-respecting Blacks and other minorities do not need patronizing and insulting preferences such as have now been rendered anathema by the Hupart decision. As Dr. Kenneth Clark is reported to have said, 'For Blacks to be held to lower standards, different standards, or in some cases no standards, is the most contemptible form of racism'..."

On the other hand, the same issue of the Alumni Magazine carried a letter by another alumnus, the Former Chief Judge of the New York State Court of Appeals, the Honorable Stanley H. Fuld:

> "Deeply interested as I am in City College and its various projects, I am taking the liberty of writing this letter because of certain criticism I have heard expressed by students and alumni

> concerning the way in which the College's Center for Biomedical Education currently selects applicants for inclusion in its program. In my judgment, such criticism is unwarranted...In a case, decided several months ago, a distinguished Federal Court Judge concluded that the Center had, in 1974, improperly applied its admissions procedure in a manner prejudicial to several unsuccessful applicants... In point of fact, City College recognized the deficiencies in those procedures and began to correct and improve the process even before the case had gone to trial...The City College Biomedical Program is a unique and ambitious undertaking which endeavors to educate and train young primary health care physicians who are imbued with the conviction not only that a doctor is more than a healer of the sick but that a doctor must deeply feel the social responsibility of his profession and be prepared to act accordingly. Moreover, the program seeks to fill a void-getting progressively worse - which is occasioned by the disappearance of the family doctor who once provided health care to the underserved, urban poor...We must bear in mind that it is not uncommon for new programs, especially those dealing in human services, to experience administrative difficulties in the early stages of their development. The City College Biomedical Program was no exception. However, it had matured, much earlier than most, and is now moving determinedly toward meeting its objective of educating badly needed primary health care physicians...The program certainly should not be condemned because of the judicial decision relating to the outdated 1974 admissions procedures. The Center for Biomedical Education and the sensitive, committed young students - who one day will, I am confident, provide a vital service to the urban communities of this state - deserve our strong support."

There is no question that initially Judge Frankel's adverse decision harmed the image of City College and created great personal anguish for Dr. Gellhorn and myself. Since Dr. Gellhorn's arrival at City College in January 1974, he had imaginatively assumed full responsibility for all aspects of the Biomedical Program. He had taken complete charge of completing the curricular design for the Program, and of monitoring the student recruitment, financial aid and retention problems. He had worked unstintingly to generate a sufficient number of "guaranteed places" from the medical schools both inside and outside New York City and to raise the additional millions of dollars required to cover the operating expenses during the first five years of the Program's existence. Dr. Gellhorn was completely responsible for recognizing the importance of maintaining close liaison with both the Executive and Legislative branches of the State government, as well as with Congressional committees on health legislation, in order to secure their approvals as well as the ultimate public financial support required. He developed the concept of the "Service Commitment" pledge that all biomedical students were asked to sign, indicating their solemn intention to provide medical services in an underserved community for a period of two years following their residency training in primary care. Finally, during his first year, Dr. Gellhorn worked out the design for streamlining the admissions procedures, before the biomedical suit was started; this design served as the basis for the admissions procedures governing the selection of the 1975 biomedical class and all classes thereafter.

Shortly after the Frankel decision, Dr. Gellhorn wrote the following letter to an editor of The New York Times:

> "The adverse decision against the City College Center for Biomedical Education admission procedure was for 1974, at a time when the experience with the program rested only on less than six months of actual class work with the result that criteria were poorly formulated. The new admissions procedures were developed for 1975 and 1976 and there has not only been no challenge but they have been cited as a model for other medical schools...It is almost unbearable that a program specifically designed to train physicians to meet a pressing social need in our inner cities should have such tough sledding...We know that the health of a significant segment of our population is bad and we firmly believe that the medical profession should participate with others in attempting to improve it. Disregard of the facts will, I believe, contribute further to the instability in our society..."

I, too, shared Dr. Gellhorn's personal distress after the Frankel decision. The Biomedical Program had become the keystone of the Urban Educational Model and I had devoted a great deal of time and energy to its nurturing, particularly before Dr. Gellhorn's arrival. I had tried to help guide the Program from its very beginning in such a way that City College would not be faced with a DeFunis or Bakke case and yet would demonstrate that "wise sensitivity to race" about which President Derek Bok of Harvard University had written so eloquently. My own anguish was intensified by the fact that I was the first Jewish President that City College ever had and I had supported Jewish causes over a period of decades. And yet, as a result of the biomedical suit and other programs that I was trying to develop at City College under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model, I became the target of vicious attacks by extreme elements in the New York Jewish community.

The sense of frustration over the biomedical suit (filed in January 1975) led me to give serious consideration during the academic year 1975-76 to leaving the City College presidency for a "Distinguished Professorship in Physics" at a Texas university. However, the arguments of friends of City College who understood what I was trying to achieve, and my own wish to see the College through the biomedical suit and the massive retrenchment that was anticipated as a result of the City's fiscal crisis, persuaded me to remain.

Leonard and Sophie Davis, the chief benefactors of City College during my presidency, possessed a perceptive understanding of the importance of the College's image. When the Frankel decision came in August 1976 - at the height of the City's fiscal crisis - they allowed us to announce their role in the creation of the Biomedical Program. They volunteered to transform their anonymous gift to the College that catalyzed the Center for Biomedical Education in September 1973 into an affirmation of faith in the future of City College. The College thus gave the beleagered Biomedical Center a name, Sophie Davis Center for Biomedical Education, at a dedication in December 1976.

I have commented briefly on the immediate aftermath of the biomedical trial. When I look back at the consequences of the biomedical trial from the vantage point of several years, I see the biomedical trial as a "tempest in a teapot". I cannot think of a single substantive change in the "social design" of the Biomedical Program that occurred as a result of the biomedical trial and Judge Frankel's Decision. This is true because Chancellor Kibbee's June 18, 1974 report on the Biomedical Program (passages of which were quoted in §3) was much closer to the mark than Judge Frankel's Decision. In contrast to Chancellor Kibbee, who placed the mistakes of the 1974 Admissions Committee in context, Judge Frankel ascribed the sinister objective of establishing a pre-determined set of quotas to the clumsy performance of an Admissions Committee operating under enormous time constraints and under the emotional pressures of various ethnic constituencies at the College. Chancellor Kibbee was right and Judge Frankel dead wrong. It is for this reason that, as soon as a seasoned medical

363

educator became permanent director of the Biomedical Program and the admissions procedures were designed to the satisfaction of all responsible authorities, it never became necessary to change a single word about the social purposes of the Biomedical Program in the original Faculty Senate Resolution, in the BHE Resolution, nor in the Benefactors' Agreement.

The heated discussions and publicity attendant upon the biomedical suit and the biomedical trial, however, underscored for responsible academic and community leaders the important concept that access to and performance in certain academic programs do not depend entirely on academic credentials but may be strongly influenced by non-academic qualifications, difficult as they are to quantify. For example, in a letter to the Editor of The Amsterdam News, an official of the American Jewish Congress wrote:

> "In our judgment it would be eminently worthwhile to discuss the possibility of a consensus based on the opinion written by Justice Douglas in his dissent in the DeFunis case...Justice Douglas took the position that a law school need not - indeed, should not - choose whom to admit solely on the basis of test scores and college grades. Factors such as poverty, deprived family background, inadequate schooling, or other circumstances that might tend to lower tests scores should be taken into account. The only criterion a school may not use, Justice Douglas said, is race...This is precisely the position taken by the American Jewish Congress in its brief on behalf of Mr. DeFunis... We do not object to considerations of cultural, economic or educational disadvantage in the college admissions process...We do object to racial preference and quotas. We do not object to special efforts to recruit, find, identify and admit students who deserve to be in college even if their high school grades or test scores do not show it. We do object to unconstitutional racial classifications..."

It is hardly necessary to argue that the deprivations spelled out above are closely correlated with the social and economic conditions of American's minorities at the present time (City College has much concrete evidence on this point) - so that the distinction is almost a semantic one. By the same token, the distinction should be made so that desirable social goals can be achieved with a minimum of rancor and ethnic conflict.

While the "social design" of the Biomedical Program remained unchanged after the Decision, the "academic design" underwent substantial change for reasons unrelated to the biomedical trial. The original B.S.-M.D. program in Primary Care Medicine was designed to take six years but the norm was transformed into seven years in order to allow for more liberal arts courses and to reduce the overpowering academic demands on the students (whether "majority" or "minority"). Entering students with high school averages below 85% had shown too much attrition and so the minimum average for eligible students to the Biomedical Program was increased to 85%. Indeed, the median high school average for students entering the Biomedical Program in recent years hovered at 93-94% and the number of "summa cum laudes" among the biomedical graduates at each City College commencement exceeded the total number of "summa cum laudes" in the rest of the College. The Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education has taken understandable pride in these indicators of academic performance.

But it should also be stated that these developments created apprehension in the Black and Hispanic communities of New York City, some of whose members felt that the City College Biomedical Program surrendered its social goals because of the biomedical suit and the biomedical trial. Up to 1979, the percentages of Black and Hispanic students admitted into the Biomedical Program under the 1975 admissions procedures did decline.

Dr. Gellhorn and Morton Slater, one of the professors in the Biomedical Program, grappled with the riddle of why minority students from inner city high schools - with superior high school averages (up to 95%), high motivation and evident social commitment - could not pass the National Proficiency Test in mathematics required for entrance into the Biomedical Program. Their studies showed that the high school teachers - for a variety of reasons, including what they reported as their preoccupation with disciplinary problems of the less gifted students - simply were not teaching the required mathematics and science.

In order to try to correct for these deficiencies, Drs. Gellhorn and Slater developed a "Bridge" program supported by the National Health Manpower Administration. "Bridge" brings to the City College campus selected high school seniors in the upper 10% of their classes who come from families with annual incomes under $12,000. They spend every afternoon during the school year taking College-taught courses in mathematics and chemistry, receive tutoring and counseling, and attend lectures on medicine and health care delivery. Of the 25 students selected for the "Bridge" program during its first year (1979) - of whom 24 were minority students without using ethnic or racial "quotas" - 17 were able to qualify for entrance into the 1980 biomedical class. Seven of these students enrolled in the Biomedical Program while the rest went to other colleges. Through "Bridge", the percentage of minority students in the Biomedical Program was increased by a factor of two from 1979 to 1980. The "Bridge" Program is continuing and promises to augment the College's efforts to fulfill both the academic and social objectives of the

Biomedical Program.

Dr. Gellhorn retired as Dean of the Sophie Davis School for Biomedical Education in September 1978. A partial quotation from his letter of resignation is a fine tribute to his leadership:

> "It has now been demonstrated that a pre-medical curriculum can be effectively integrated with the basic medical sciences and these, in turn, can be closely related to clinical medicine. The academic success of our students in national medical examinations attest to this as does the ease of integration of our graduates into the clinical clerkships of the third year of the medical schools to which they have transferred. Another signal acknowledgement that the biomedical program has achieved credibility is the fact that the number of places committed to our students for advanced standing has been increased from thirty to more than seventy in four years and every student who has met the academic requirements has been placed..."

Dr. Gellhorn was succeeded by Dr. Leonard Meiselas, former Executive Associate Dean of the SUNY - Stony Brook Medical Center, under whose vigorous leadership the Biomedical Program should continue its upward pattern of achievement and service. The original agreement with Leonard and Sophie Davis creating the Center for Biomedical Education made provision for other health-related programs besides the B.S.-M.D. Program. Because of the time and energy expended in dealing with the biomedical suit and the biomedical trial, only a limited number of additional programs - nucleated by the B.S.-M.D. program - could be started. Examples were: the Physicians Assistant Program which the Sophie Davis School for Biomedical Education undertook with Harlem Hospital; the "Health, Medicine and Society" Program which was spun off from the B.S.-M.D. Program and placed under the jurisdiction of the Social Science Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Science; and the Enriched Pre-Medical Program developed jointly by the Sophie Davis Center for

Biomedical Education and the Science Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Science. Dean Meiselas should be able to develop more initiatives of this type so that many sectors of City College, the surrounding community and metropolitan New York will receive the ever-growing benefits of the Sophie Davis School for Biomedical Education.

Chapter 7

"Community Outreach of an Urban College"

§1. Pressures from the Inner City

I came to the City College presidency with the conviction that the present-day university can be a most effective instrument of social change in the United States and that City College could play a major societal role in a large urban setting. After thirty years in academic science at the University of Rochester, I had learned to pay homage to the long history of effort in America to create institutions of higher learning where teaching can be free of political pressures and ideological expediency, and where research and scholarship can be pursued without being subjected to the dictates of arbitrary authority. But I had also learned from the experience of the turbulent Sixties that the massive problems of urban decay in the U.S. required some form of university intervention. As Eric Ashby wrote in his book, "Adapting Universities to a Technological Society", timely adaptation will be possible if university faculties "reconcile the intellectual detachment essential for good scholarship with the social concern essential for the good life."

I tried to argue throughout my stewardship at City College that Ashby wasright and that intellectual detachment and social concern could not only coexist but could even be mutually reinforcing. This did not mean that all urban colleges and universities bore the same responsibility to their metropolitan centers. Clearly, a coherent urban mission for American higher education was difficult to define because of the diversity of urban colleges and universities. An urban college or university located in an affluent middle class neighborhood was subject to quite different urban pressures than a college or university located in the inner city. As I tried to explain in my 1975 Daedulus article (written for the special issue "American Higher Education: Toward an Uncertain Future"):

> "The public institutions of higher learning located in the inner cities are in a class of their own: location in the inner city propels these educational institutions into a conscious concern for the all-pervasive and exacerbating problems of ghetto life right outside their gates. The urban public university located in the inner city is truly part of the urban environment and must respond to the insistent urban pressures upon it by a thoroughgoing reassessment of its educational priorities and functions..."

This statement certainly applied to City College with its extraordinary mix of ethnic backgrounds, religions and nationalities and its location in the midst of Black and Hispanic Harlem.

Harlem, once one of American's most vibrant communities and the site of City College since the early part of the century epitomized all the problems of poor housing, unemployment and high crime rate one associated with the inner city. Yet, it was also the focus of hope and considerable effort on the part of organizations like the Harlem Urban Development Corporation, the Harlem Commonwealth Council and the Upton Chamber of Commerce, whose efforts could clearly be seen in the many new buildings either completed or under construction along 125th Street, the main east-west artery of uptown Manhattan.

Colleges in the inner cities have to make choices about their relationship to their immediate neighborhoods when buildings on adjoining streets begin to empty and when packs of stray dogs start foraging for food at the edge of their campuses. One choice is to move away, clearly an option that public colleges can not even consider, although some private colleges, as an alternative, open satellite campuses to which they eventually relocate.

Another choice is to build a wall around the campus by purchasing abandoned or marginal buildings and either razing them, putting them to use as dormitories and offices or creating buffer zones of small industry or research parks. Examples of the fortress position are legion across the country among the institutions whose rich endowments made it possible for them in the Fifties and Sixties to extend their campus boundaries out into the neighboring streets. City College, in fact, had extended its own reach in the Fifties when it took control of the old campus of Manhattanville College which was on its way to the suburbs. City also acquired a few of the imposing old townhouses north of its gate at 140th Street which were used primarily for student activities. Columbia University's experience in attempting to start construction of a gymnasium set off its occupation by community residents in 1968 and served as a warning signal from the poor and minority populations in upper Manhattan that they no longer would remain passive observers of university expansionism.

Although the term "community" in this chapter will, by no means, be restricted to the area closely contiguous to the City College campus, the instant and immediate challenge to the institution by the people of Harlem and the obvious dependency of the College on a safe and stable neighborhood pointed our first efforts at community outreach toward our neighborhood and toward New York City.

In a way, the Five Demands had alerted me to the rising insistance that City College serve, through its admissions, staffing and curricular policies, the aspirations of New York's disenfranchised, but nothing in Rochester had quite prepared me for my first weeks in the President's Office where I was exposed to the tactics and persistence of organized efforts to chart the College's course. An uneasy relationship existed between City College and the neighboring Harlem community when I took office in September 1970. Until the mid-Sixties, many persons in Harlem perceived City College as that "White citadel on the hill", with little concern for the "all-pervasive and exacerbating" ghetto problems of the surrounding community. The image of City College lingered on despite the fact that for many years the College had followed a fairly liberal minority employment policy, and the College's School of Education had close working relationships with several public schools in the neighborhood.

The first issue to be joined concerned construction on City College's new science and physical education building, scheduled to open sometime in 1972. The College was still negotiating with representatives of Governor Rockefeller in Albany to secure approval of a Physical Master Plan when I arrived in September 1970. The location of the campus in Harlem, then rapidly deteriorating, added urgency to the negotiations. Early reconstruction of the City College campus could accelerate the entire process of urban renewal in the surrounding geographic area, as well as lift the morale of both faculty and students who were understandably depressed by the impact of a rundown and overcrowded campus.

I attached so much importance to the revitalization of the City College campus that I had paid several special visits to the College - before I assumed office - to meet with a specially created Ad Hoc Faculty-Student Committee on the Physical Master Plan. Within days of taking office, I poured over the recommendations of this committee, reached decisions and made appointments with appropriate state officials in Albany. It therefore came as a considerable shock when, in the middle of September, I received a visit from Mr. James Haughton, a City College alumnus and leader of a Harlem community organization called "Fight Back". He told me that minorities were underrepresented in the construction trades (a true statement) and that "Fight Back" had reached the decision to use the ongoing construction of the large City College Science and Physical Education Building as the instrument to further the community goal of substantially increasing the number of minority workers, chiefly from Harlem, in the construction trades. He went on to say, without hyperbole or much change in inflection, that he intended to shut down the work on the Science Building and to occupy the site with his group unless I personally saw to it that more minority workers were immediately put to work on the building. I informed Mr. Haughton that I supported his objective (of increasing the number of minority construction workers), that I would look into the situation with regard to the Science Building and that the College would explore other ways in which it might be helpful in placing minority workers in the construction industry (such as seeking assistance from several alumni who were heavily engaged in the building industry), but that I would not agree to any halt in the completion of the Science Building whose facilities were badly needed for City College students, including increasingly large numbers of minority students. Mr. Haughton countered by stating flatly that he would return on a specified day with his "Fight Back" members and friends to stop construction on the Science Building unless I voluntarily acquiesced in the shutdown. It was clear that trouble loomed ahead for City College if "Fight Back" tangled with the union workers on the Science Building. Apart from the dangers to the persons involved, any violence that might eventuate would not only delay completion of the much-needed Science Building but would also serve as an excuse to suspend the approval of the total Physical Master Plan by Albany. A serious confrontation on the City College campus between "hardhats" and community residents would perpetuate the sense of campus insecurity engendered by the previous year's South Campus takeover.

I decided to act resolutely. I first issued a statement (on September 15) from which I quote:

> "Although the buildings will be used by the College, the structures themselves will be built and owned by the New York State Dormitory Authority...Thus, the College is not a party to contractual arrangements and has no official authority over construction activities.
>
> Nevertheless, as a matter of what is right, I have committed myself and the College Administration to take whatever steps we can to enhance Black and Puerto Rican employment on present and future construction projects...
>
> As plans for Dormitory Authority construction of additional buildings to be used by City College move forward, my Administration will exert every influence it can to ensure that the building proposals and the final contracts contain provisions for strong programs designed to increase Black and Puerto Rican employment,... We shall also urge that the State Dormitory Authority participate in apprenticeship programs designed to train workers for journeyman

> positions and that it solicit bids for contracts from Black and Puerto Rican contractors under favorable conditions. The College will also explore possible ways in which the technical knowledge of faculty specialists can be utilized to help contractors who lack familiarity with bidding and other complex managerial procedures involved in public construction work...
>
> It is imperative that the building program proceed as rapidly as possible to enable us to provide adequate facilities for the increasing number of students now entering The City College under the Open Enrollment policy. I have committed myself to provide the best possible educational opportunities for our expanding student body. I have also committed myself to explore, in cooperation with students, faculty and community groups, every suggestion for increasing opportunities for Black and Puerto Rican workers at campus construction sites..."

After this statement was issued, I held a second meeting with Mr. Haughton and tried to persuade him that a demonstration might produce violence but could hardly make me more sympathetic to his cause. He reiterated his intention to go through with the demonstration (on September 24) and so the day before, I met with officials of the 26th Police Precinct (in which the College is located) and arranged for an "alert" the next day, (i.e. a sufficient number of police ready for trouble but not directly on the campus).

True to his word, Mr. Haughton began September 24 with mass picketing by his group. His strategy was to augment the size of his demonstration with sympathetic City College students and community residents as the morning wore on and, presumably, persuade the construction workers on the Science Building (numbering approximately 100) to leave their jobs under the psychological pressure of the mass picketing, thereby achieving his objective of a shutdown. Mr. Haughton's miscalculation was that the building was at the stage of construction (all fourteen floors were up but otherwise completely open) when the workers on the job could loose patience and start hurling bricks on the pickets. As noon approached, this threat became ominous and informed Mr. Haughton that I would be compelled to call the police (experienced in these matters, he knew that they were on the "alert") to avoid the bloody consequences of a confrontation. As a conciliatory gesture, however, I offered to advise the State Dormitory Authority (SDA) to send the construction workers home for the afternoon (to make it clear that the College supported the objective of his demonstration if not the method) provided that: 1) he would immediately withdraw his picket line and 2) he understood unequivocally that I would not repeat the half-day shutdown. Mr. Haughton accepted the first condition and took cognizance of the second. As a result of the rapid pace of events that morning, CUNY Central had delegated complete authority to me to deal with the situation, and when I phoned in my recommendation to the SDA, approval came quickly. As the construction workers started to leave the half-finished Science Building, one of Mayor Lindsay's assistants burst into my office and shouted that I had made a terrible mistake, that Mr. Haughton's "troops would capture" the Science Building and that a disastrous occupation would take place. I told the Mayor's assistant that I had confidence in Mr. Haughton's solemn commitment to withdraw his picket line and suggested that he verify whether this promise had been honored. He returned with a look of grudging surprise and allowed that there was no sign of the "Fight Back" pickets on the campus and that peace had returned to Convent Avenue (the main artery of the City College campus).

By sheer coincidence, the City College Faculty Senate was meeting on the afternoon of September 24 (a meeting that I could not attend because of my preoccupation with the Science Building problem) and the "Fight Back" demonstration came up for discussion. Two motions were passed:

> "The Faculty Senate urges that construction at all CUNY sites be terminated by the State Dormitory Authority," the first motion read, "in order to have a maximum impact on redressing existing injustices in employment practices..."
>
> "Failing this, and to indicate our moral indignation at existing hiring practices," the second motion stated, "we support closing of the Science and Physical Education site pending favorable outcome of negotiations to hire the 70 minority group construction workers who have appealed to the State Dormitory Authority for jobs at any of the CUNY sites..."

The Faculty Senate could only advise the president and this was one of the very rare occasions when I declined to accept its advice. Due to my inability to attend the meeting, I had been unable to share the details of my strategy with the Senate and at a subsequent meeting the snafu was unraveled.

In the days that followed, it was incumbent upon me to make a sincere effort to assist Mr. Haughton achieve his goal of increased minority participation in the construction trades. Within two days of the "Fight Back" demonstration, on a Saturday morning, I convened a meeting at my home of City College alumni prominent in the building industry, briefing them on the problem facing the College, and soliciting their help to persuade the construction unions to augment opportunities for minority workers (through direct placement, training programs, and in other ways). This meeting was typical of many which were held in later years. I came to count on the keen interest of

CCNY alumni in the College's welfare and their ready willingness to expend time, effort, and if necessary, money to enable the President of their Alma Mater to cope with a continuous stream of seemingly intractable problems. It was at this meeting that I first met Dorothy Gordon, Affirmative Action Coordinator for the State Office Building in Harlem, whose knowledge of the construction industry and minority needs complimented her evenhandedness and fairmindedness. (She later became my Special Assistant for Minority Affairs and then moved on to become the Affirmative Action Coordinator for the SDA Director.) The following week, Ms. Gordon convened a meeting of the contractors responsible for the construction of the Science Building and with their help, alumni help, and her own contacts, we made genuine progress towards the fulfillment of my pledge to Mr. Haughton (i.e., to find jobs for qualified persons on his list).

The first major crisis during my administration was typical of the many exercises in "crisis management" that I was called upon to deal with in later years. I guess, by its very definition, events in a crisis move so rapidly that persons not very close to the situation inevitably make statements that do not correspond to the true state of affairs. Thus, on September 27, the day after I had called this special meeting with alumni in the building industry and worked out the strategy mentioned above, some panelists on a CBS radio program devoted to the 'Fight Back' demonstration (which had achieved considerable mass media coverage in the New York area) stated that:

> "Dr. Marshak's concern to continue with the construction of the Science Building as well as the other commitments of the $150

million Master Plan, was an example of protecting and upholding the rights of property over those of human life, specifically the lives of Blacks and Puerto Ricans in Harlem who were unemployed, on welfare, and endangered by disease and hunger."

Undeterred by this criticism, I took the initiative the next day, at its monthly meeting, to persuade the BHE to pass a resolution supporting the concept of increased minority representation in CUNY-wide construction; the resolution read in part:

> "WHEREAS, The Board of Higher Education is embarking on a major program of construction in order to provide necessary higher education facilities at the City University; and
>
> WHEREAS, Such a program presents an almost unparalleled opportunity to enhance the employment of minority workers in the construction industry and the involvement of minority contractors in building projects; and...
>
> WHEREAS, Relatively few Blacks and Puerto Ricans are presently being employed in such construction, including the City University campus construction projects being undertaken by the Dormitory Authority; and
>
> WHEREAS, The immediate focus of concern is the Science Building now under construction on The City College campus; therefore be it
>
> RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education finds the demands for non-discrimination in jobs in construction projects to be morally and socially just and reasonable and extremely urgent; and be it further
>
> RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education urges that the State of New York and its agencies, including the State Dormitory Authority, which constructs facilities for the senior colleges of the City University...develop affirmative action to guarantee fair employment of skilled minority workers, to train minority workers and to encourage bidding by minority contractors..."

Mr. Haughton seemed pleased with the BHE resolution and with the other efforts the College was making to help place minority workers in the construction industry and several weeks later invited me to speak to the "Fight Back" membership in their storefront headquarters in Central Harlem. In a ramshackle vacant store, about 100 unemployed construction workers from the community listened to a candid speech from me describing what City College had done and could not do to help their cause, and responded with great warmth.

It should be pointed out that the College really had no authority or control over a new construction project or the personnel practices associated with it; legally, a new construction project immediately came under the jurisdiction of the SDA as soon as it was authorized. In the early years of my presidency, the SDA was still getting organized - insofar as the CUNY construction program was concerned - and it was willing to relinquish some authority to the College president during a period of crisis (as in the 'Fight Back' incident). In later years - and this covered the period of construction of Aaron Davis Hall and the North Academic Center - the SDA asserted its full authority and the College's vital interest to ensure that new construction proceeded smoothly and expeditiously had to be expressed in meetings between College and SDA officials and the invocation of the BHE resolution cited above. The lines of communication that developed during these meetings proved valuable, however, when in 1974, two minority construction workers' organizations decided to force a work stoppage. The College persuaded the SDA to continue negotiations to prevent violence. At the point of "shutdown", the SDA kept its communications channels open and violence was in fact averted. This is not to say that the SDA was always successful or never ran into difficult problems. The following year, for example, a militant Harlem community organization (that was trying to displace "Fight Back" as the leader in the effort to increase the number of construction jobs for minorities) attempted to halt construction on the campus until more Harlem workers (whom they wanted to select) were hired. The result was a pitched brick and bottle-throwing battle between construction workers and community protesters which had to be quelled by the police (the only time police were used during my administration). The City's fiscal crisis brought all new construction on the campus to a halt in November 1975, and when it started up several years later, the SDA and Harlem were both eager to get on with the job.

Another example of pressures from the inner city impinging on the College campus was the heroin problem that surfaced during the early months of my administration. Interestingly enough, while some of the dope pushers strayed on to the campus (which is completely open as befits a public college campus) from the neighborhood, the strongest voices for dealing severely with the heroin problem, came from students who resided in the neighboring community, led by the president of the Student Senate, James Small. The discovery that there are saints and sinners in every community was not earth-shaking but it did go contrary to popular prejudice.

I noted in the Preface to these Memoirs that the heroin problem was called to my attention by a City College student reporter after an interview held in my University of Rochester Office during the Spring of 1970, shortly after my appointment as president. I remembered this remark when I arrived on the campus in September. I instructed the Dean of Students to appoint an Ad Hoc committee of students and faculty to ascertain the facts and come up with recommendations. Before this committee could be appointed, a front page story broke in The New York Times with the headline: "Purchase and Use of Heroin Common Sight at City College".

Even allowing for some exaggeration, it was obvious that City College could not live with the situation. Again, I first issued a statement which said in part (according to a New York Times followup article):

> 'We must certainly eliminate hard drugs from this campus," he declared. 'We will provide severe penalties and take whatever action is necessary'...The 53-year-old educator...said that a coherent program would be developed with strong measures to rid the campus of lawbreakers as well as establish medical, psychiatric and educational means to assist students..."

And then I invited the Head of the 26th Police Precinct (whom I had met the first day of my arrival on campus and with whom the College maintained a friendly relationship during the entire nine years of my presidency) to decide on a course of action. We agreed that it was absolutely essential to identify the persons selling the heroin - whether they were students or not - and to then prosecute the culprits to the full extent of the law. I was informed that this could only be accomplished through the use of undercover agents, to which I assented without hesitation. Within two months, about ten heroin pushers (mostly students) were apprehended and it was remarkable how rapidly the heroin problem disappeared from the City College campus.

Interestingly enough, the Student Senate was not satisfied with this disposition of the drug problem. While it supported my authorization of the use of undercover agents, it urged me to take the leadership in establishing an official college policy on the sale and use of drugs by City College students. I appointed a student-faculty committee (co-chaired by two students) and there emerged a set of regulations approved by the President's Policy Advisory Council (consisting of the Student Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and all Deans). These regulations, unmatched in their toughness by any secular college in the country, are worth quoting:

> "The College recognizes that the primary victim of drug abuse is the drug abuser himself. Therefore The College acknowledges that it has the responsibility to help its students who are drug abusers through education, counseling and referral to appropriate agencies and programs.
>
> On the other hand, the dealer in illegal drugs harms other people and the institution. Similarly, groups of students using illegal drugs or abusing legal drugs publicly on College property affect others. The College has the responsibility to its students, their parents and the public to insure that The College does not become a sanctuary for pushers and that non-users of drugs may use all the facilities of The College freely and comfortably. Therefore:
>
> 1. The College security force will be directed to apprehend dealers in illegal drugs and turn them over to the Police.
>
> 2. The College security force will be directed to apprehend groups of students publicly using illegal drugs.
>
> 3. Students apprehended for use of "hard" drugs will be referred to an appropriate treatment program. Such cases will be reported to the Narcotics Addiction Control Commission, which must be done by law. The Commission is an independent agency, and by law may not release any of its information to civil authorities, and is essentially a research agency of the State of New York.
>
> 4. Students apprehended for use of soft drugs will be referred to a counseling program.
>
> 5. Students apprehended for the third time will be subject to disciplinary procedures leading to expulsion..."

As I stated earlier, the leadership in this operation was taken by students from Harlem and demonstrated, among other things, the value attached to a disciplined educational environment by most minority students.

§2 Community Outreach of the College

For a number of years prior to 1970 the College had given attention to establishing closer relationships with its Harlem neighbors and to rendering appropriate services. Most notable were the already cited efforts of the School of Education, the "practicum" courses in the Urban and Ethnic Studies Department (started in 1969), the outreach program of the Psychological Center, the Educational Clinic, the Audiology Clinic and summer programs for neighborhood children. By 1970, in fact, there were 500 Harlem youngsters in CCNY's summer educational program. Also, research, consultancy, and tutorial services were provided to local schools and school districts and City College students were placed as volunteers in several community agencies and facilities. Psychological and audiological services were provided to local school children and the College's athletic facilities and staff were made available to local youngsters.

However, I did not think that a good neighbor policy was sufficient to deal with the pressing problems of racial discrimination and the despair and alienation resulting from life in ghettos marked by high unemployment, high population density, and the decay of the physical environment. Various programs were carried over to my administration and were of great importance to the Black, Hispanic, and other New York minority communities, including the SEEK program. Through the continuation and expansion of the SEEK program, the College was able to admit and educate larger numbers of neighborhood youth than ever before in its history. Through a variety of other programs, that were integral to the Urban Educational Model, the College worked diligently to create and sustain a supportive learning environment that would enhance the success of neighborhood youth from the nearby Black and Hispanic communities.

To genuinely 'reach out' to the neighboring community was a much more complex and time-consuming endeavor than the internal reorganization of the curriculum to relate to contemporary urban needs. The problems of the surrounding community were enormous; for the College to attempt to fulfill its social role of serving that community, including the provision of technical assistance, meant that first the community had to help the College identify both the problems to be tackled and possible realistic solutions. Therefore, one of the first things I did in the area of community relations was to obtain a salary line from CUNY Central for a high level (assistant vice-president) community affairs coordinator. CUNY in fact, provided me with two lines so that the College could address itself to "community outreach" on a broad basis. My primary concern was to have a coordinator initiate community service projects, work to get faculty involved (that is why I wanted an individual with a Ph.D.) and coordinate the activities of all City College staff involved in community-oriented activities.

In the Spring of 1971, I hired Dr. Bernard Gifford, a very able administrator, as assistant vice-president for community affairs. He began immediately to pull together various ongoing community service projects and to establish a structure for generating innovative community service programs. To meet the latter goal, Dr. Gifford established an Office of Puerto Rican Program Planning and Development and appointed Ms. Yolanda Sanchez as its Director in July, 1971. (Subsequently, such offices for Blacks and Asians were also created.) Unfortunately, Dr. Gifford resigned shortly thereafter to accept a Fellowship with the Kennedy School of Government (he went on to become President of the Rand Corporation of New York and then Deputy Chancellor of the New York Board of Education). After Dr. Gifford's departure, from the academic year 1971-72 through 1975-76, many aspects of City College's 'community outreach' effort were handled by the Offices of Black, Puerto Rican and Asian Program Planning and Development. In 1972, Dr. Marjorie Henderson was appointed Director of Black Program Planning and Development; in 1974, Mr. Harold Lui was appointed Director of Asian Program Planning and Development.

The responsibilities of these directors fell within three major categories: 1) administrative assignments, 2) work with their respective ethnic faculty, staff and students at City College and 3) program planning and development for their respective ethnic communities. Ms. Sanchez for example, performed a number of important duties for the campus community which were helpful to her own ethnic community as well as the College. She was the Administration's representative on the Policy Board of the College's new Day Care Center for the children of students and staff. In addition, she (and the other directors later) was the administrative representative on several College governance boards such as the Community Advisory Board for the School of General Studies, the College's Task Force on High School Recruitment, the Faculty Senate's Committee on Inter-ethnic Concerns, the Urban Institute of the School of Education as well as the Affirmative Action Committee and the Executive Committee of the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts. Her other activities included maintaining working relationships between the College and a number of Hispanic community groups, including the Puerto Rican Guidance Center of nearby Amsterday Avenue, and aiding in the recruitment of minority staff, as she did, for the School of Education's program in bilingual-bicultural education begun in 1972. Similar responsibilities were assigned to the Director of Black Program Planning and Development, Dr. Henderson, and her Asian counterpart, Mr. Lui.

The nature of the work of these Program Planning and Development Directors with their minority communities was twofold: 1) an aggressive outreach to those ethnic groups in the community known best to the Director - including explanation of College policies; and 2) requests to the Director of services of special significance to the ethnic group that could be performed by the College. An example of the former was the effort made by Dr. Henderson to recruit Black candidates for the student body and staff for the Center for Biomedical Education immediately after its establishment. An example of the latter approach was the request made by the St. Nicholas Park Redevelopment Group for advice from the College. Also, during the years 1972-74, in addition to the creation of these three ethnic offices of program planning and development, I created a special post and appointed Ms. Dorothy Gordon as Special Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs. She coordinated the three offices for Ethnic Program Planning and Development, served as Executive Secretary of the College's Affirmative Action Committee and performed a variety of tasks related to minority affairs.

Through its affirmative action program, the first CUNY affirmative action program accepted by the Office of Civil Rights, the College attempted to deal with the problems of unemployment and uncertain job prospects as the most serious problems affecting New York's Black and Hispanic populations. First, the College intensified its efforts to add to its staff qualified neighborhood residents in teaching, clerical, building and grounds, security, construction and counseling positions. The College took an active role to make affirmative action meaningful to its neighbors. Beginning in 1971, with special funds provided by the State, the School of General Studies inaugurated a series of community-oriented countinuing education seminars. One of the first was a series of seminars on bidding and other procedures which were designed to train small, independent, neighborhood-based contractors on how to bid for small and medium-sized construction contracts at the College and for other such projects. The seminars were conducted by representatives from the Business, Purchasing, Campus Planning and Development Offices at City College and the Office of the General Counsel of the BHE. In presenting these seminars, the College cooperated with the Association of United Contractors of America, a Harlem-based professional organization of minority contractors, and the Inter-Racial Council for Business Opportunity of New York. In a closely related development, the College began to work with local community leaders on the design of jointly sponsored programs of continuing education for neighborhood adults.

In 1972, a new series of specially created evening courses for adults was initiated to teach community residents how to organize campaigns for better housing as well as how to renovate, finance and manage neighborhood housing. Workshops on health, drug problems and security were also organized. The security training project was arranged by the Center for Urban and Environmental Problems (CUEP) in conjunction with the City Board of Education. (As I pointed out in Chapter 2, CUEP was primarily a College-based research and consultation institute but it was also intended to become involved in community service programs.) The Security Workshop helped to train some 600 security guards to serve in the city's public schools as a deterrent to crime and vandalism in the public schools. The project consisted of four one-week sessions on fundamentals of psychology, security procedures and other appropriate subjects taught by College faculty members and Board of Education personnel.

Through the School of Education, tutorial and consultancy services were broadened in the early Seventies and a number of research and evaluation projects undertaken by the School of Education and neighboring public school districts. One project was the Training of Teachers of Teachers (TTT) Program; another, in cooperation with School District 5, established a Weekend Academy Program to assess and strenghten the skills of teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals and parents. Yet another program was designed to advance the training of Day Care Center paraprofessionals.

During the Seventies, undoubtedly the best known of the School of Education's community outreach programs was the Workshop Center for Open Education, organized at the beginning of the decade by Professor Lillian Weber. Professor Weber is probably the most distinguished American proponent of the Open Classroom approach to teaching young children in the primary grades. This is not the place - nor am I sufficiently expert in the field of education - to discuss the serious issues of educational methodology and the learning process in young children which have been joined between the traditionalists and the "avant garde" Open Classroom movement led by persons like Professor Weber. Suffice to say, her enthusiasm to develop new techniques for motivating and teaching inner city children was infectious, and the support she generated from foundations and federalagencies had to be matched by adequate facilities provided by the College. Professor Weber was given part of the basement floor of one of the old gothic buildings (Shepard Hall) and proceeded to convert the rundown rooms into sparkling centers of activity where large numbers of teachers from the neighborhood schools, other New York City schools and elsewhere, commingled and were indoctrinated in the philosophy and technology of the Open Classroom movement. Professor Weber's part of Shepard Hall can be easily identified by the continuous exhibition of works of children produced in the open classrooms staffed by her trainees. Professor

Weber also reached out to neighborhood parents, offering to familiarize them with the objectives and accomplishments of her program. There is no question that Professor Weber's Open Classroom operation was one of the happiest examples of community outreach by City College during my presidency.

Contained within a number of City College's Urban Educational Model special programs were ones of immediate community service such as the Physician's Assistant training program which was jointly operated by Harlem Hospital and the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education. Both the Center for Academic Skills and the Campus High School were community service projects in that the College made a commitment to conduct research into the causes of skills and literacy disadvantagement and to test new model curricula aimed at overcoming academic deficiencies both at the adult and secondary school levels.

One should note that a major focus of both the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies and the Center for Legal Education and Urban Policy was on training specialists for urban projects. The plans to train professionals in development management, real estate development, and other non-traditional roles for architects, lawyers, paralegals and business management specialists should be helpful not only to the Harlem community but to New York City in general. Lastly, the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts was making an important contribution to the cultural life of Harlem and the facilities of Aaron Davis Hall were available to the local community not simply the College. The Center's programs and facilities were coordinated through a link with the Harlem Cultural Center.

§3 Genesis of the Office of Community and Public Affairs

During 1973 a public relations firm was hired to study a number of the College's programs and administrative structures in order to make recommendations about how it could operate more efficiently and improve its "public image". A recommendation was made that an overall Office of Communications and Public Affairs (OCPA) be set up at City College that would coordinate the College's media or public relations, governmental relations and internal college relations. I thought that community relations should also be added to the responsibilities of this office since the directors of the three ethnic program planning and development offices had begun to function more as advocates of their particular ethnic communities rather than as true liaisons between their communities and the College. A central administrative structure and official could pull together and coordinate the activities of a number of staff people involved in the College's external relations and internal communications network. As a result, I hired an experienced public relations person, Robert F. Carroll, then deputy administrator of the Human Resources Administration, who became in January 1974, Assistant Vice-President for Communications and Public Affairs. He assumed responsibility for the Offices of Black, Puerto Rican and Asian Program Planning and Development as well as the Public Relations Office, the Affirmative Action Program and a number of other related assignments.

The placement of the community relations program under OCPA was an attempt to establish a liaison or cooperative relationship with a wide variety of public and community organizations, agencies and committees. Where it was appropriate, the College's OCPA joined existing groups - and these liaisons or memberships gave the College the opportunity to report on its programs and other areas of interest which partly fulfilled the institution's commitment to community accountability. The College also made an effort to develop joint projects with community groups and to provide technical assistance and resources - such as financing, the use of college facilities, proposal writing, and program planning. One of the major projects carried out under OCPA was to organize a conference on "A National Policy for Urban America" in May 1976 under the co-chairmanship of Vice-President Carroll and Dean Joan Girgus (of the Social Science Division), seeking answers for the deepening crisis in New York City and cities throughout the country. Participants included Ambassador Sol Linowitz, Governor Carey, Felix Rohatyn, Richard Wade, Roger Starr, Robert Wood, Robert Brown, Donna Shalala, and other outstanding persons involved in molding policy for urban America. The three half-day sessions were devoted to economic policy, social policy and educational policy. The conference was supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the Morton Globus Fund of City College. It was a highly successful conference but some measure of the variegated character of a college president's existence is indicated by the fact that it was held one week after the conclusion of the Biomedical Trial!

For the first two years of its operation, the Office of Communications and Public Affairs was subsidized by a gift of $100,000 per year from alumnus Leonard Davis. Mr. Davis had also generously paid for the study by the public relations firm, Ruder and Finn, which had recommended the creation of the OCPA. However, by 1976, Mr. Davis' commitment expired and this unfortunately occurred at the height of the city's period of fiscal stringency and CUNY retrenchment. For budgetary reasons, the three Directors of the Black, Puerto Rican and Asian Program Planning and Development had to be retrenched and the OCPA operation reduced to a substantially smaller scale. It should be remembered that community affairs was only one responsibility of that office which coordinated all internal and external communications, public relations and media contacts.

Despite the cutbacks, significant efforts were made to maintain already established ties with community groups and leaders, to continue ongoing projects and to try to create new ties with individuals and organizations, especially with those interested in the revitalization and development of Harlem. Having within a few years opened up channels of communication in the community and demonstrated the College's commitment to community service, more and more people came for consultation and discussion regarding community matters in which City College administration, faculty and staff might be interested. To cite an instance: in 1976, the Director of the Harlem Interfaith Counseling Service, the Rev. Frederick E. Dennard, consulted with Vice President Carroll and the Dean of the School of Architecture regarding technical assistance for the renovation of the Mount Morris West buildings in Harlem. A feasibility estimate, architectual advice and financial estimates were provided to give the Director a good idea of how to proceed. It would appear that previous City College projects had sensitized community leaders and people to the College's genuine concern for the development of the community.

The Office of Communications and Public Affairs came to an end in December 1977 with the resignation of Robert Carroll from his position as Assistant Vice President in charge of OCPA. By the Summer of 1978, when I appointed Mr. Cyril Tyson as Assistant Vice President and Director of the Office of Public and Community Affairs, I had decided that it was vital for the College to have a top-level administrator whose only responsibility was community and public affairs. The media, communications and public relations aspects of OCPA were assigned to a separate office with its own director, Gladys Wurtemberg.

Vice President Tyson's first major responsibility was the coordination and preparation of the 'Nigerian Workshop' on "Technological Development in Nigeria" held at City College in April, 1979 and detailed in Chapter 5. In a way, the Nigeria Workshop was community outreach on a global scale. At the same time, Vice President Tyson as my community outreach liaison (and as a man of much experience in city, Black community affairs and business), made progress in linking up the City College Administration with important groups in Harlem that were concerned with the reconstruction and revitalization of the Harlem community, such as the Harlem Urban Development Corporation (HUDC), the Uptown Chamber of Commerce and the Harlem Commonwealth Council. These plans were to be furthered by a small Urban Economic Development Center (UEDC) under the aegis of the Office of Community and Public Affairs. The purpose of the UEDC was to assist in the economic development of Black Harlem, Hispanic Harlem, and Chinatown by making available City College's faculty expertise in a coordinated fashion. The Schools of Architecture and Engineering, the Computation Center, the Black, Puerto Rican, and Asian Studies Departments, as well as the traditional departments of Economics, Sociology, and Political Science at City College could all contribute to the technological, cultural, and community aspects of economic development in the disadvantaged areas of New York City. It was a specific responsibility of the Office of Community and Public Affairs to monitor the operation of the UEDC.

The work of Vice President Tyson's Office of Public and Community Affairs was divided into two major areas of responsibility: community relations and program planning and development. The community relations responsibility required that the Office define an organization and management approach to the College's involvement in community activities with particular attention to the areas of program and facilities use. The office centralized the final responsibility as to what College/community collaborative efforts were feasible and secured appropriate internal approval and support for activities. The program planning and development capability of this Office provided Mr. Tyson with specific design and follow-through capability. This ensured that time frames were understood and complied with and accountability defined.

City College's Office of Public and Community Affairs, in its first year (1978-79) of operation, not only discussed several projects with the HUDC, but assigned personnel to work with HUDC to evaluate these projects (it should be noted that HUDC is an incorporated subsidiary of the New York State Urban Development

Corporation which was created: to plan, develop and finance housing for low, moderate and middle income families; to assist commercial and industrial development in Harlem; and to provide needed cultural, educational and other civic amenities in the Harlem area). Some of these projects were: student housing in Logan Hospital, the renovation of Africa House, a High Technology Industrial Park in Harlem, the Davis Center-Harlem Cultural Center Linkage, and the International Trade Complex for the "Third World" being planned - under Congressman Rangel's leadership - on 125th Street. While Mr. Tyson's Office at City College only began its work in my final year at the College, its work was very encouraging and its involvement in two projects - the High Technology Industrial Park and the International Trade Complex - exemplify the goals I sought to inculcate during my tenure at City College: urban community service and international linkage, especially with the developing nations.

The High Technology Industrial Park was a proposal for the establishment of an urban renewal-type industrial park in the area north of 125th Street and south of City College (130th Street). Such a project could draw on interested and qualified faculty with whom industry could work either on advanced technology problems of a research nature or immediate problems of design, manufacturing, operations management, or new product development and applications. If industries established plants in such an industrial park, jobs would be created for local residents at all levels - technical personnel, secretarial, administrative, clerical, machinist and supervisory.

Another exciting project in which Vice President Tyson's Office became involved wasthat of the International Trade Complex. The Complex is planned for construction near the Harlem State Office Building at 125th Street and Lenox Avenue. The sponsors of the project are HUDC, New York State UDC and the Harlem Commonwealth Council. The threefold purpose of the International Trade Complex is: to provide a foundation for the strengthening of the partnership between the Third World developing countries and the U.S.; to create and expand business and job opportunities through new import/export tourist and retail trade; and to make a substantial contribution to the economic revitalization of Harlem. The Harlem facility will complement the World Trade Center of New York whose officials are providing technical support to HUDC for this project. If the International Trade Center Complex, estimated to cost $100 million, comes to fruition, this will make an important contribution to the revitalization of Harlem. City College as well as other neighboring institutions, should benefit greatly.

§4 Urban-Grant University Legislation

Despite the fact that the College had de facto launched the Urban Educational Model by September 1973 with the admission of the first biomedical class, I never ceased to believe in the necessity of a federally funded 'urban-grant' university program. In late 1973, I was invited by my former student, Warren Cheston, then Chancellor of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, to meet with him and his deans to discuss the Urban Educational Model and its possible application to his institution. During our exchange of views, I told Chancellor Cheston of my brief and only slightly encouraging efforts to enlist congressional support for urban-grant university legislation and that I was preoccupied at City College at that time with crisis management and the implementation of the Urban Educational Model. Consequently, I would have to suspend work on the urban-grant university concept for some time. Furthermore, I pointed out to Chancellor Cheston that Clark Kerr's eloquent espousal of the urban-grant university concept in his 1967 Phi Beta Kappa address at City College had been toned down considerably in a report on "The Campus and the City" issued by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (of which Clark Kerr was chairman) in December 1972. (Clark Kerr was apparently overruled in a large committee - consisting of representatives of private and public universities - which reached a compromise on the issue by suggesting an experimental program of "urban-grant allocations to ten carefully selected universities and colleges to see what they can do with imaginative overall approaches to urban problems.") Chancellor Cheston seemed to be so taken with the urban-grant university concept that I urged him to "pick up the ball" and develop his own strategy to keep the project alive.

Chancellor Cheston organized an informal discussion group of seven urban public university presidents and chancellors, primarily from the Midwest, to meet on a regular basis in order to both refine the concept and to devise a strategy that would lead to ultimate enactment of urban grant university legislation. In addition to Chancellor Cheston, the "Urban Seven" included: Werner Baum, then Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Warren Bennis, then President, University of Cincinnati; George Cullen, Jr. then President, Wayne State University; Carois Golino, then President, University of Massachusetts (the only Easterner); C. Peter Magrath, President, University of Minnesota; and James Olsen, then President, University of Missouri - Kansas City.

The first order of business of the "Urban Seven" was to develop a workable definition of an urban university that would qualify for federal "urban-grant" support. The group agreed that a suitable definition would have the institution take notice of its geographical location and student population when determining the nature of its teaching, research, and service programs. A true urban university would be located in a large urban setting and be committed primarily to serving that urban community, as demonstrated by the following characteristics:

- a concentration of students from the urban area;
- an academic curriculum of particular relevance to these students;
- a commitment to substantial institutional research and service in areas related to the needs and priorities of the urban area.
- a significant access program for students traditionally excluded from American higher education because of social or economic status, race, sex, or age.

Besides its "urban-relatedness," the "Urban Seven" felt an eligible urban university would have to be comprehensive in an academic sense. It would have to offer a broadly-based undergraduate curriculum (with a balanced mixture of liberal education and specialized urban-related disciplines) and graduate and professional training on the doctoral level. It would obviously have to be committed to scholarly research, providing support and service for such research.

Chancellor Cheston kept sending me copies of the documents generated by the "Urban Seven" but he also informed me towards the end of 1974 that he himself was becoming increasingly pre-occupied with "crisis management" at his own institution and that the group had reached a plateau in its level of activity. I was so impressed by the progress made through Cheston's initiative, that I offered to "take back the ball" and he readily acquiesced. I therefore convened a meeting in New York City in January 1975, to which I invited the "Urban Seven", Chancellor Robert Kibbee of CUNY and several other presidents and chancellors of urban public universities who, I had reason to think, would be sympathetic to pursuing the project. The initial limitation to urban public universities (City College seemed to be an anachronism but, as I have indicated previously, the College was really a mini-university and certainly satisfied the definition of the "comprehensive urban university" articulated by the "Urban Seven") was consciously drawn in order to determine whether any consensus could be achieved even within a small group of such universities; it was always anticipated that the self-appointed "urban club" would later be opened up to other public universities as well as urban private universities satisfying reasonable criteria. After two days of deliberations, the small group assembled in New York reached tentative agreement on the basic document of the "Urban Seven" and committed itself to working for the establishment of a federally funded urban grant university program. Such potential urban grant support, we felt, would be appropriate for any comprehensive urban university providing public services for its urban area. We also formed ourselves officially into the Committee of Urban Public Universities (CUPU) and elected officers: Chancellor Kibbee as Chairperson and my Vice President of Communications and Public Affairs, Robert Carroll, as Acting Executive Director. Carroll's office at City College served as the temporary headquarters of CUPU.

CUPU spent the next couple of years assembling a catalog of urban ills and programs for their amelioration that included a major input from the member urban universities; it also expanded its membership to over twenty institutions. By the Spring of 1977, CUPU was prepared to engage in serious lobbying efforts to enact urban-grant university legislation; it set up shop in Washington (in an office shared with the University of Louisville, by then one of the CUPU members) and appointed its first executive director, Jim Harrison, who had been in charge of the Washington staff for one of the Congressmen. At about the same time, CUPU decided to open up its membership to private urban universities - as originally planned - and CUPU became the acronym for the "Committee of Urban Program Universities" (rather than the "Committee of Urban Public Universities"). With this change and greater visibility, CUPU has grown to a membership in excess of 30 institutions.

Under the experienced hand of Mr. Harrison, CUPU was able to translate its lobbying activities into a Urban-Grant University Act (UGUA) placed before the 95th Congress at the end of 1977 (HR 7328). The UGUA, patterned after the land-grant and sea-grant acts, would make grants available to urban universities to develop their capacity to find solutions to urban problems in cooperation with local governments and to make their educational research and service capabilities more available to the urban communities in which they were located. Approval of a comprehensive grant would carry with it a designation as an 'urban-grant university' for a five-year period. The UGUA would not "fund the study of urban affairs" but its purpose would be rather to:

> "aid urban universities to help find answers to urban problems, and aid such universities to make their resources more readily and effectively available to the urban communities in which they are located.".

In more specific terms, funds would be provided to:

> "enable urban universities to work with their local governments in a coordinated and cooperative attack upon urban problems. The local government and the community, rather than the university, would establish the priority of need for applied research and related services in resolving its most pressing problems...[it is envisioned] that once these priorities are determined, the urban university or universities will evaluate their capabilities to respond to these priorities, and where there is a commonly agreed-upon approach to attacking the problem, application would be made for funds..."

The UGUA bill was rejected by the 95th Congress but was reintroduced on March 22, 1979 into the 96th Congress by Rep. William D. Ford of Michigan (HR 5192). It was strongly supported by Senators Thomas Eagleton of Missouri and Jacob Javits of New York. The basic concept of the UGUA bill remained the same as when it was originally introduced. Both bills were based on the precedents of the Land-Grant Acts of the last century and the Sea-Grant Act of a decade ago. The new bill authorized federal support over a four-year period ($50 million in 1981, $70 million in 1982, $90 million in 1983 and $100 million in 1984) for urban universities to mobilize their resources to aid cities in dealing with their problems. It is likely that the above budgetary levels will be reduced in the final legislation but it is believed that the continual hard work and lobbying efforts of CUPU will finally pay off with the enactment of Urban-Grant University legislation by the 96th Congress.

The prospect of categorical federal support for urban colleges and universities dedicated to the concept of "community outreach" is most gratifying. The passage of the Urban-Grant University Act will finally acknowledge the obligation of the federal government - in the last two decades of the twentieth century and beyond - to provide comprehensive support to those urban colleges and universities that have committed themselves to serve their crisis-ridden cities through: 1) the channelling of intellectual talent and fiscal resources into the design of urban-related curricula; 2) the fostering of on-campus urban-oriented research; and 3) the creation of community-based 'experiment stations' and 'extension services'.

The commitment to public service was a core part of the Urban Educational Model for City College and for the variety of programs based on that model. However, the reality, not the theory, of developing a viable administrative structure for and meaningful

407

programs of community outreach was not easy. It took my administration a long time and many experiments, a process marked by fits and starts, to reach the point where I could say that I thought we had made a good start. As with other aspects of the 'urban-grant' university concept, implementation of a reasonable plan for community outreach was difficult without the federal financial aid built into the idea of the urban-grant program. In the absence of such aid, one had to make do with what one had, and in the case of City College, that meant building on the kinds of programs and services already in existence, both at the College and within the community. Even so, the $150 million of new construction on the City College campus, the opening of Aaron Davis Hall for the Performing Arts, the establishment of the Campus High School, the initiation of a Physician's Assistant Program at Harlem Hospital, the projected cooperation between City College and the new International Trade Center Complex, and other such developments possess great potential for improving the quality of urban life in the neighborhood of City College and for setting an example of how the shared concerns of a public university and an urban community can be transformed into constructive action for mutual benefit.

With the passage of the Urban-Grant University Act, City College's philosophy of community outreach, which visualized not escape, not a fortress, but its integration into the living social, economic and political being of the people and City of New York, is likely to achieve in the not-too-distant future the national acceptance that it deserves.

Chapter 8

"Physical Master Planning and Fund Raising for Public Higher Education"

> "Government provides the uniform base. To scale the peaks of excellence, the publicy-supported institutions must turn to private philanthropy."
>
> --Dr. Herman B. Wells, Chancellor
> University of Indiana

In the preceding chapters I have discussed how the humanistic mission of City College was reformulated and updated - through the Urban Educational Model - for the decade of the Seventies. The advent of Open Admissions was the first step in returning City College to its humanistic mission. Open Admissions had to be augmented by innovative academic programs under the Urban Educational Model to complete the definition of an updated humanistic mission of City College for the decade of the Seventies. However, no enlarged mission of the College could be implemented, no intellectual effort to articulate the larger mission could be sustained over a period of time, without paying serious attention to the practical necessities of adequate physical facilities and sufficient financial resources. In what follows, I shall relate my experience with physical master planning and fundraising at City College for the insight it may provide into the challenges and opportunities in an urban public university.

§1 Physical Master Planning in an Urban Public College

As City College entered the decade of the Seventies, its physical plant was in very poor shape, indeed. With the arrival of the first wave of Open Admissions students at City College in September 1970, the classrooms, laboratories, cafeterias and study space for students became woefully overcrowded. Even the ceremonial Great Hall had to be partitioned into classrooms. The hundred or more additional faculty (twenty in the English Department alone) hired to teach the new cohorts of academically disadvantaged students led to a gross inadequacy of office space; I recall taking a tour of the campus and finding departments where several faculty members shared a single desk (let alone a single room); research space was in even shorter supply. The lack of available funds for maintenance of campus facilities - resulting from the large instructional demands on the budget-led to a generally run-down appearance of all facilities, further depressing the morale of students and faculty. Although the new Science and Physical Education building was under construction, the contractors were giving a low priority to its completion and the opening date was at least two years off. A Physical Master Plan which made provision for complete renovation of the Gothic buildings of the North Campus and sufficient new construction to serve the needs of a projected 1975 student body had not yet been approved by Governor Rockefeller (the funding source) although the Board of Regents had given its blessings; in any case, it would take most of the decade to bring the Physical Master Plan to its full realization. It should be noted that the location of City College in

Harlem broadened the significance of the Physical Master Plan negotiations. Rapid reconstruction of the City College campus could help accelerate the entire process of urban renewal in the surrounding geographical area, an essential step in arresting the creeping advance of the "South Bronx" blight. There was no reason why one could not think of a fully consummated Physical Master Plan leading to the creation of an urban educational park with City College as its center.

The impact of the run-down and overcrowded campus conditions on student life and student activities should be mentioned separately. To say the least, the appearance of the campus was not conducive to socializing among the students, to the development of a sense of community and shared extracurricular concerns. As a "subway college" with large numbers of students from impoverished homes, City College had a special obligation to provide a campus climate which would enrich the lives of the students outside the classroom rather than further alienate them.

It was therefore with a sense of deep concern and great urgency that I read, immediately upon my appointment as City College President, an impressive document called "The City College Master Plan 1969-75". This document, prepared by John Carl Warnecke, F.A.I.A., architect and planning consultant, was the culmination of over two years of intensive study of the College - both educationally and architecturally - and embodied the architectural realization of the educational requirements of the College as projected to 1975. Understandably, the Physical Master Plan had not anticipated certain late developments - in particular, the decision to move the starting date for Open Admissions in all of CUNY from 1975 to 1970. I therefore decided to review the contents of the Physical Master Plan as soon as I was appointed City College President in March 1970 - six months before I actually took office - in consultation with a newly-created committee of faculty and student representatives. The review was rushed to completion by June 1970 to expedite the approval process in Albany and, after some forceful negotiations, approval was finally obtained from the Governor's office in November 1970.

From the present vantage point, it appears that the decision to give the highest priority to final revision of the Physical Master Plan by the campus community during the Spring of 1970 and to secure approval from the Governor by the Fall of 1970 was correct. As a result of that decision, City College should be the first senior college in City University to have its Physical Master Plan essentially in place within the next couple of years. With the completion of new construction in 1981-82, City College should have one of the finest urban campuses in the country and the consequences of this situation for the future of City College could be as felicitous as the completion of the Gothic North Campus was in 1908. After 1908, when the St. Nicholas Heights Campus was completed, the student body and the academic programs at City College proliferated within a few years in size and scope, transforming the institution into the prototype of the College that achieved a national reputation. Those years have been called the "Golden Age" of City College. There is no reason why the

Eighties should not mark the beginning of a new Golden Age for the College.

However, I have collapsed this part of the story too much and it is worth recording some of the agonizing delays caused by the economic stringencies of City and State, political complications, and normal bureaucratic impediments that accompany the implementation of an approved Physical Master Plan by the highest authories in the State. The Physical Master Plan approved by the Governor's office in November 1970 made provision for 1,747,000 net assignable square feet (NASF) of non-residential space, broken down as follows:

	NASF
Retention, renovation or alteration of existing structures (chiefly Gothic buildings on the North Campus)......	673,000
New construction previously authorized (Science and Physical Education Building).....	382,000
New construction authorized (North Academic Center and South Academic Center)......	692,000
TOTAL	1,747,000

This approved Physical Master Plan was supposed to take care of the space needs of approximately 15,000 full-time equivalent students in the day session (including undergraduate, SEEK, Master's and doctoral students) and was budgeted for a total amount in excess of $200,000,000.

In presenting the Physical Master Plan to Albany during the Summer of 1970, the College had not specified precisely how the 692,000 NASF of new construction would be split between the North

Academic Center and the South Academic Center and this decision had to be made during the Spring of 1971. It was determined that the North Academic Center would contain 476,000 NASF to house the new expanded Morris R. Cohen Library, a campus center (including new dining facilities for students and faculty), a "Little Theatre," as well as the School of Education and the Social Science Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Science. With 476,000 NASF assigned to the North Academic Center, this left 216,000 NASF for the South Academic Center - an amount sufficient to house the "Large Theatre-Auditorium" (32,000 NASF) and the other needs of the College in the remaining 184,000 NASF. While the precise assignment of space to various college functions in the remaining 184,000 NASF of the South Academic Center was being debated, a fortunate occurrence took place which changed in a major way the contours of the City College Physical Master Plan.

In the middle of May, 1971 (on the very last day of classes of the Spring semester), I received a phone call from a City College alumnus, Mr. Leonard Davis (Class of 1944), complimenting me good-naturedly on the fact that there had been no student takeovers during the first year of my presidency, I did not have the courage to inform him that this was not completely accurate - a group of Puerto Rican students had briefly occupied the Romance Languages Department office but were persuaded to leave quietly after I had explained to them the mistaken nature of their grievances. Mr. Davis invited me for dinner to discuss a possible gift to the College. I had met Leonard and Sophie Davis the previous February in Palm Beach, at a small cocktail party hosted by another alumnus, Mr. Samuel Rudin (founder of Rudin Management, Inc.). I had no inkling at the time of Mr. Davis' call of his deep affection for Alma Mater and his unpublicized support of two distinguished persons serving on the City College faculty at that time (the late Professor Herman Shumlin in the Speech and Theatre Department and the late Professor Hans Morgenthau in the Political Science Department).

I naturally came to the dinner meeting with the Davises prepared with a "shopping list", which included performing arts, but which, I must confess, had as its top priority support for UCUP (University Center for Urban Problems - see Chapter 2). It soon became clear that Mr. Davis had been very attentive at the Rudin cocktail party and had reacted positively to a thesis that I had presented at the February affair, namely that with State approval of its Physical Master Plan, the College was in greatest need of programmatic endowment money. In particular, Leonard Davis stated that he was interested in endowing a Center for Performing Arts to be housed in the 32,000 NASF "Large Theatre-Auditorium" included in the approved Physical Master Plan for City College. Without further ado, he announced that he would give $2.5 million to the College in order to establish the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts. Needless to say, I was overwhelmed since this was the largest outright gift by a living person in the history of City College or any unit of City University (the Baruch gift of $11 million, to endow the School of Business Administration at City College, was a bequest; the Baruch Endowment was transferred to Baruch College when it was split off from City College in 1968), and I accepted with gratitude.

It did not require great imagination on my part to realize that Mr. Davis' generous gift of $2.5 million to provide programmatic endowment for the performing arts mandated a rethinking of the decision to place the "Large Theatre-Auditorium" within the confines of the South Academic Center. It was immediately obvious that the new Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts would have to be housed in a free-standing dedicated building. Provided that the College stayed within the magical 32,000 NASF already approved by the State for performing arts programs, this arrangement was acceptable to the BHE and the SDA and ultimately led to the construction of the free-standing, multi-purpose Aaron Davis Hall, a stunningly beautiful and excellently equipped performing arts building with three theatres, a large open air plaza, workshop rooms for theatre, dance, film and music, and exhibition galleries. It was a fine example of the beneficial impact a private donor can have on a public institution.

In any case, by 1972, the budget had been approved for the construction of Aaron Davis Hall, the North Academic Center, the renovation of two of the Gothic buildings (Baskerville Hall and Wingate Hall), and the South Campus athletic facility. The table below indicates the state of affairs as of the Fall of 1972.

With the decision made about Aaron Davis Hall, it is seen from the table that the South Academic Center was reduced to a relatively small building (of 184,000 NASF), hardly enough to justify

Status of Physical Master Plan in Fall of 1972

Building	NASF	Estimated Completion Date	Estimated Cost
*Science and Phys. Ed. Bldg.	382,000	April 1973	$ 33,870,000
*North Academic Center	476,000	January 1977	90,692,000
*Aaron Davis Hall	32,000	January 1976	5,377,000
*Renovation of Baskerville and Wingate		November 1975	3,679,000
South Campus Athletic Facility		March 1975	400,000
South Academic Center	184,000	to be determined	36,213,000
Renovation of remaining Buildings		to be determined	31,380,000
Total Estimated Cost of Master Plan			$202,502,000

*Budget approved by BHE as of Fall of 1972

spreading it over the South Campus, as was intended in the early version of the Physical Master Plan. With this recognition came the decision to move the so-called South Academic Center to the middle of the City College campus and to "landbank" the lower half of the South Campus for future purposes. With further instructions that the North Academic Center had to direct its major emphasis inwards to the campus (while still maintaining a sympathetic openness to the community), the architectural firm of John Carl Warnecke developed two alternative designs: the "rectilinear" and "diagonal" designs. There then developed a difference of opinion between the College community and CUNY Central with regard to the two designs, and by mutual consent, the dispute was arbitrated by the well-knwon builder, Mr. Carl Morse, who ruled in favor of the College's preference (the "diagonal" design). During this "arbitration" meeting with Mr. Morse, he suggested that the method of "fast-tracking" be used in the construction of the North Academic Center. "Fast-tracking" is an accelerated approach to the construction of large buildings that allows the architect to prepare the drawings for the next stage of construction while the previous stage is being built. The "fast-tracking" method is used a great deal in the construction of privately-owned buildings but rarely in the construction of public buildings because it is a bit risky, requiring an expert construction manager to "track" the entire process. The College was successful in securing State approval of "fast-tracking" in the construction of the North Academic Center but, as we shall see, it turned out to be a pyrrhic victory.

It is also seen from the above table that in the Fall of 1972 it was expected that the Science and Physical Education Building would be completed by the Spring of 1973, the South Campus Athletic Facility by the Spring of 1975, Baskerville and Wingate Halls would be renovated by the Fall of 1975, Aaron Davis Hall would be completed by the Winter of 1976, and the North Academic Center by the Winter of 1977. Every one of these projects was beset by at least one major crisis and only the Science and Physical Education Building and the South Campus Athletic Facility kept to their schedules. The target date for the completion of the Science and Physical Education Building was met but not without the resolution of some major problems which are worth mentioning. The first major problem connected with the Science and Physical Education Building occurred shortly after my arrival as City College President in the Fall of 1970 in connection with the "Fight Back" demonstration. I have recounted this incident in Chapter 7 and need only reiterate the College's good fortune in achieving rapid resolution of this conflict because of the statesmanlike approach taken by the leader of "Fight Back", James Haughton, and the devotion of a group of alumni in the building industry. The next crisis occurred when the contractors slowly reduced the workforce on the Science and Physical Education Building. I persuaded the SDA to convene a special meeting of all contractors connected with the Science and Physical Education Buildings and after some table-thumping the work accelerated and the building was completed. This 14-story building - with its magnificent view of the city from the upper floors - now houses all the Science departments, the Department of Physical and Health Education and the Sophie Davis School for Biomedical Education. The South Campus Athletic Facility was completed more or less on time but without the artificial turf that had originally been approved - the last minute the city knocked out the artifical turf because it was considered such an excellent idea that "a bad precedent would be set" for other public educational institutions!

With the completion of the Science and Physical Education Building and the South Campus Athletic Facility, misfortune struck the Physical Master Plan of City College. Apart from normal bureaucratic delays, the growing fiscal crisis of New York City soon impacted on the ability of the SDA to sell bonds on the public market to continue construction of the North Academic Center and Aaron Davis Hall and, by November 1975, construction ceased on both projects. (I learned at that time, to my chagrin, that the SDA's bond-selling policy vis-a-vis the construction of CUNY buildings was not to sell sufficient bonds to underwrite the full cost of a CUNY building once it received budgetary approval, but instead to sell sufficient bonds each year to maintain the planned rate of progress on all CUNY buildings under construction; as far as I know, this policy was not followed by SUNY or any of the private institutions in New York State and certainly added to the woes of the CUNY colleges.) It was also impossible to start work on the renovation of the two Gothic Buildings (Baskerville and Wingate Halls) called for by the Physical Master Plan.

Cessation of work on the Physical Master Plan in November 1975 was only a portent of the devastating fiscal crisis which struck New York City in the Summer of 1976 and hence CUNY and City College. That crisis resulted in massive retrenchment of faculty and staff, led to the imposition of tuition on full-time undergraduate students for the first time in the 129 year-old history of City College, and culminated with the modification of Open Admissions policy discussed in Chapter 3. The more serious developments of retrenchment had to be dealt with by the City College Central Administration (see §2). It was also necessary to resume the construction of Aaron Davis Hall, the renovation of Baskerville and Wingate Halls, and the construction of the North Academic Center (by the Summer of 1977, it was clear that the construction of the much-reduced South Academic Center would be lost from the Physical Master Plan, and that the renovation of buildings other than Baskerville and Wingate Halls would be indefinitely delayed).

How to achieve the resumption of construction of Aaron Davis Hall - which was 30% complete and on which so much of the future of the performing arts programs at City College depended - became a project of the highest priority. The sense of urgency was increased by the existence of a legal agreement between Mr. and Mrs. Davis and the College that called for the surrender of the $2.5 million endowment by City College (to another institution) if Aaron Davis Hall was not completed by 1977. (When the lawyers for the Davises and the College had originally negotiated the terms of the agreement for the Leonard Davis Center of Performing Arts, I was asked whether I had any objection, in speaking for the College, to a clause requiring completion of Aaron Davis Hall within five years of its budgetary approval by the State. It seemed inconceivable to me that any problem could arise that would delay the completion of such a relatively small building beyond the five-year time frame and I readily assented to the condition.) As the fiscal storm gathered over New York City and reverberated in Albany, it was evident that the public bond market would remain closed to the SDA at least through 1976 and there was simply no way of completing the construction of Aaron Davis Hall by 1977 with public funds.

The only alternative was the "private" bond market whereby some institution such as a bank might be persuaded to purchase the entire bond issue required to pay for the completion of Aaron Davis Hall. Actually, this possibility was called to my attention by Arnold Picker, a City College alumnus who gave me excellent advice throughout my nine years as president, and who had created the Picker Film Institute in the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts. Mr. Picker tried to convince several commerical banks in New York City and outside to purchase , under very favorable conditions, the $6.2 million SDA Bond Issue required to complete Aaron Davis Hall. The SDA was very supportive in this situation and did not wish to see City College lose its performing arts program. But, despite the fact that an SDA bond was backed up by students' fees (and was not a "moral obligation" bond, as many people believed), the lack of confidence in the fiscal solvency of New York City was so great at that time that all responses to Mr. Picker were negative. In desperation, I turned for advice and assistance to an old friend, Gerard Piel, whose concern for the welfare of City College was exceeded only by his success as publisher of the Scientific American. He suggested that his former classmate at Harvard, "Rusty" Crawford, Chairman of the Bowery Savings Bank, might be willing to give me a hearing.

Soon, the three of us - Mr. Crawford, Mr. Piel and myself - were meeting in the Bowery Chairman's office on 42nd Street and, to my great surprise, Mr. Crawford started the conversation by proudly informing me that "Grandfather Crawford" was the valedictorian of his City College class in 1869, more than a century earlier. Mr. Piel and I were immediately taken by the charm and significance of the meeting, quite independently of any concrete results that might emerge from it. Here was a prominent member of the New York City Business Establishment in 1976, recalling with pride the intellectual prowess of his family - two generations back - when City College was serving the children of the poor, the immigrant and the disadvantaged of Western Europe. (The story became even more charming and more meaningful when the College's Director of Public Relations at that time, Iz Levins, in tracing out the Hanford association with City College, discovered that "Granduncle Hanford" was the valedictorian of his City College class in 1875.) Mr. Crawford was sympathetic and when the Davises graciously consented to the use of the $2.5 million endowment (for the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts) as collateral, the Bowery Savings Bank agreed to purchase a private bond issue for Aaron Davis Hall. Construction of Aaron Davis Hall could thereby be resumed, leading to its completion during the Summer of 1979, two years after the deadline set by the original Agreement.

Apart from reviving the Aaron Davis Hall construction, the purchase of the private bond issue by the Bowery Savings Bank triggered a sequence of events that finally led to the resumption of construction of the North Academic Center by the Spring of 1978. The Lehman College Science Building was the next priority on the SDA list for CUNY (using the criterion of percentage completion of the building) and a consortium of banks (led by the Dollar Savings Bank) followed the example set by the Bowery

Saving Bank for Aaron Davis Hall and purchased a private bond issue that permitted the completion of the Lehman building. With the Lehman building out of the way, the North Academic Center became the next eligible candidate for a bond issue but the amount required to finish this large complex of buildings ($82 million) was beyond the capability of even a consortium of banks to manage under the conditions prevailing in the market place. However, the fiscal rescuing operation for New York City had gained sufficient momentum, chiefly through the creation of the Emergency Financial Control Board, that the SDA received authorization from Governor Hugh Carey to offer a public bond issue for the North Academic Center. The time was the Fall of 1977 and the issue was over-subscribed.

The resumption of the Hunter College construction was next on the list in order of priority but unfortunately, Mayor Edward Koch, immediately upon assuming office January 1, 1978, persuaded Governor Carey to wait for Mayoral Approval of the construction needs of CUNY before authorizing any further public bond issues. The postponement of the Hunter restart (finally approved within the past year) did not, of course, affect the City College North Academic Center since the money was already available for the resumption of construction. The renovation of Baskerville and Wingate Halls was started by the Summer of 1978 with the help of a direct federal grant awarded under a program for urgent construction projects throughout the country. The scuttling of the South Academic Center can not really be faulted in view of the reduction in enrollment at City College - resulting from the imposition of tuition and the curtailment of Open Admissions in the aftermath of the city's 1976 fiscal crisis; the delay in the renovation of the remaining Gothic buildings will hopefully be of short duration. And thus, after many trials and tribulations, a pragmatic alliance was forged of private enterprise, the State, and the Federal government to complete the essential construction under the City College Physical Master Plan.

With the Gothic North Campus (the Gothic buildings of the North Campus have been cited as among the most interesting specimens of Gothic architecture in the country), the contemporary Science and Physical Education Building and North Academic Center, and the very modern Aaron Davis Hall, City College will have one of the most distinctive urban public campuses in the country. The physical facilities that will be available to City College by 1981-82 should attract increasing numbers of students to its campus and encourage the College to pursue its goals with increased vigor and success. At the same time, the investment in the new buildings on the City College campus in an amount approaching $150,000,000 should have a major impact on the economic revitalization of the neighboring community (as discussed in Chapter 7) which, in turn, should help the College achieve its own academic goals as a responsive urban public institution of higher education located in the inner city.

§12 Tax-Levy Budget for City College

When I accepted the City College presidency, I knew that it would be my solemn obligation to work with the faculty to develop aggressively the educational strategies that would meet the challenges of Open Admissions. I also knew that City College would not be able to maintain its reputation for quality education if the faculty and administration did not bend every effort to enrich existing courses of study and create innovative programs that would attract gifted students to the College. It could not be otherwise. City College's historical humanistic mission could not be updated for the Seventies without pursuing both paths at once.

And I also understood that the simultaneous pursuit of open access and academic excellence - an understanding, I am pleased to say, that gradually gained currency in the City College community - could not be successful without facing up to the financial implications of this decision. The simple truth was that the "tax-levy" budget which the College received from the taxpayers of City and State was not enough to support the new Open Admissions policy and to initiate and maintain the kinds of projects which would keep the College in the forefront of high quality educational institutions. The only way to foster growth and excellence in educational programming was to look beyond the College's tax-levy support and present its urgent needs to outside funding sources: the federal government, private foundations, corporations, alumni, and interested and sympathetic individuals who, though not alumni of the College, nevertheless believed in its special mission.

I used to call the "tax-levy" budget of City College (a part of the total CUNY budget) a "bread and butter" budget and to argue that any further "nourishment" for the College would have to come from the federal and private sources mentioned above. In actual fact, there was an annual budget fight in Albany to maintain the "bread and butter" budget for the CUNY system. During the first few years of my presidency, despite the large increase in student enrollment because of the Open Admissions policy, Governor Rockefeller would annually threaten to cut or freeze the budget (which was tantamount to a cut in view of the constantly increasing student enrollment in the early years of the decade) unless tuition charges were imposed on full-time undergraduates in the CUNY system. I quote from a letter that I wrote to the Governor in January 1972 protesting his negative approach to funding public higher education in New York City:

> "I am writing to you out of my deep concern for the future of public higher education in the City of New York...It seems to me that your recent statements and public attitudes portend a grim future for the City University and the hundreds of thousands of students it serves. The "freeze budget" you are advocating is nothing less than a deterioration budget. With it, the university can only function in severely crippled fashion, if it can function at all. Curtailment of the open admissions policy and imposition of tuition fees would not only hurt the poor and disadvantaged in New York City but impose great hardship on many middle class families as well (who continue to reside in the city for the free tuition benefits extended to their children). Nor is it clear that the revenues gained by tuition would offset additional costs that would be incurred by the State ..."

During those early years, this was part of an annual political ritual. Sensitive to the political leaders of upstate New York - who could not understand why free tuition should be continued in New York City when tuition was charged in the SUNY system, and who refused to recognize the vastly superior physical facilities and amenities for

SUNY students as compared to CUNY students (approximately $3 billion of new construction had been invested in the SUNY system and CUNY was still trying to get approval for one-fifth of that amount) - the Governor would start the political ritual dance by proposing the imposition of tuition in return for an adequate budget. This would be followed by mobilization of our constituencies-students, faculty, and alumni - travelling to Albany to lobby with members of the New York State Legislature. The CUNY lobbying effort would be complicated by a counter-lobbying operation by the private colleges and universities of New York State who demanded large expenditures of tax-levy state dollars for their institutions and students. For historical reasons, these lobbying efforts of the private institutions of higher education in New York State were generally fruitful and the privates succeeded in extracting more tax-levy funds from New York State than have the privates from all other states combined. At one time, a tabulation was made of the various forms of state aid to the privates and the partial list included:

> ...contractual agreements for various specific services or for distributing institutional aid; direct institutional aid (e.g. Bundy Plan); aid to disadvantaged students; facilities assistance - the issuing of State bonds for capital expenses, for example; assistance to professional schools to defray the expense of education in medicine, dentistry and nursing; student assistance in the form of grants, scholarships, assistantships, loans; and endowed professorships (e.g. the Einstein and Schweitzer professorships in New York State...

As a result of the lobbying and counter-lobbying, CUNY would generally emerge with a "bread and butter" budget and the privates with increased State aid in one or more of the categories (sometimes these increases would help the public sector of higher education in New York State as well as the private sector but this was more the exception than the rule). The bottom dropped out of the CUNY budget as a result of the 1975-76 fiscal crisis.

The implication in any case was clear; during the first half of the decade, one could at best expect to end up with a tax-levy budget which would take care of basic educational needs but certainly not one that would enable City College to engage in serious academic innovation and in enhancing the quality of its educational offerings. Just as privates without large endowments (and even those with huge endowments were ready and eager to join the fight for state funds) could only maintain their educational excellence through supplementary state funding, public institutions of higher education had to go after private and federal dollars.

§3 Private Fundraising for an Urban Public College

The idea of launching a private fundraising campaign for City College was not new. In 1947, the Centennial Year, the College had set forth to raise $7 million, no small sum in that post-war period. The campaign, unfortunately, met less than one third of its intended goal, although it did lead to the permanent establishment of the City College Fund. The reasons for that relative failure were, of course, complex, but certainly centered on the lack of a strong and unifying vision which could provide the necessary impetus for raising a large sum of money. As the decade of the Seventies began to unfold, the motivating force for a major Development Campaign was being fashioned through the mechanism of the Urban Educational Model. By bringing together within a single conceptual framework a wide range of special programs which the College was initiating in order to meet the needs of its extremely diverse student body and the many communities it served, the Urban Educational Model made it possible for the College to communicate an image of itself which could, and would, underpin a major Development Campaign.

This last statement may sound somewhat self-serving so let me cite the views of the outside professional fundraising firm, Oram Associates, as expressed in its July 1974 Advisory Report to the College on the feasibility of launching the Development Campaign. In that report, the key conclusions were (italics are Oram's):

"...The strategic and tactical core of Oram Associates' approach to an organized campaign in the private sector (i.e., foundations, corporations, alumni and non-alumni individuals and the exclusion of all governmental sources - city, state or federal) is that *the most exciting and compelling appeal for philanthropic response rests in the new programs, centers and institutes growing out of the College's restated mission as a multi-ethnic "urban educational model."*

The nub of the argument is that the College has undertaken a bold educational experiment which, if successful, can be replicated in any urban cosmos; and if successful, can profoundly and positively affect the quality of life in all our cities: can the College fortunately meld the classical liberal arts tradition; the compensatory function mandated by the admission of large numbers of underprepared students; and the glittering promise of bold new programs in medicine, law, architecture, performing arts, communications, and others?

Fund-raising feasibility insofar as it can be ascertained *relies* not on past evidence of success in organized money raising but rather *on the extent to which the urban educational model and the programs it generates can be related to the grant-making practices and charitable impulses of a relatively small number of critically important major disbursing foundations, a slightly larger number of corporations and a broad base of alumni and non-alumni support*...There are, of course, other more traditional programs within the College which merit, and can obtain, encouragement in the private sector. But on an institutional basis, our judgment is that *the most exciting and compelling appeal for private philanthropic response is the series of centers and institutes operating under the rubric of the model.* This is the strategic and tactical core of Oram Associates' approach to the College's money raising..."

While the update of the humanistic mission of City College for the Seventies was still being refined in the form of the Urban Educational Model at the beginning of the decade, the unexpectedly generous gift of Leonard and Sophie Davis for Performing Arts in November 1971 encouraged the College to set its sights fairly high for a future fundraising venture. With the added gift from Arnold Picker for the funding of the Picker Film Institute, the Leonard Davis Center for the Performing Arts came into being to provide talented City College students with professional training in the major performing arts; theatre, music, dance and film.

The Davis and Picker gifts persuaded the City College Fund Board of Directors to undertake a million dollar annual gift campaign (three times the usual level) during the 125th Anniversary Year of the College, in 1972. The Urban Educational Model was beginning to be articulated and the 125th Anniversary Year solicitation carried the appeal:

> "Although The City College will be 125 years old this spring, the concept of alumni support for a public institution is relatively new. When the City College Fund was organized and some alumni began thinking of raising a million dollars in one year, the idea seemed as unlikely as flying to the moon.
>
> Yet here we are today on the close of 1971 and men have indeed walked on the surface of the moon. And our contemporaries at Columbia and NYU and Ohio State and Yale and Purdue and Missouri and Harvard and some two dozen more private and public institutions do contribute a million dollars or more to their alumni fund.

> Our Campaign for the Million Dollar Year comes at a critical time. Never before has our College been faced with greater challenges or greater opportunities. We are in the midst of a vast rebuilding program that will result in a campus of beauty and dignity. The first stage, the new fourteen-story Science Building and the Physical Education Building with its new gymnasium, should be completed next fall. The intellectual and academic development is moving just as quickly. In almost every scholarly discipline, the College is seeking new horizons of excellence with new programs already introduced or in the process of being planned.
>
> Taken together, this is a blueprint for an educational breakthrough, a breathtaking leap forward to enhance the traditional areas of academic excellence with strides that take us to the forefront of the new urgencies demanded by our contemporary environment..."

This appeal to the alumni and similar appeals to selected foundations for support of several of the components of the Urban Educational Model enabled the College to meet the 125th Anniversary goal. The successful completion of that campaign promoted plans for a major development campaign for City College.

Before a final decision to launch a Development Campaign for City College could be made, a series of prior steps had to be traversed which would first ensure the support of the academic goals of such a campaign by the faculty and deans of the College, then support for the fiscal goals of the campaign by the City College Fund Board of Directors, and finally, a clear understanding of the compatibility between the academic and fiscal goals on the part of Central Administration. The process was started with meetings and retreats for faculty and administration to establish priorities for the College's academic goals as a model urban educational institution. The Binder Committee, the Anderson Committee and the Greystone Conference (all discussed in Chapter 2) were successive stages in this process. The

Binder Committee's report was distributed widely on campus in January 1974, the Anderson Committee's report was available in the Spring, and the Greystone Conference followed in June. Meanwhile, I held several meetings with the City College Fund Board which decided to enlist the help of the outside professional fundraising firm, Oram Associates, in April to advise the College on the fiscal goals (the chief conclusions of Oram Associates were mentioned earlier in connection with the overall theme of the Development Campaign, to wit the Urban Educational Model.) While all this was going on, I felt a desperate need for someone who could help bring together the academic and fiscal goals and accept overall responsibility for any development campaign that might ensue. The ideal person was Professor Alice Chandler who, as Faculty Senate Chairman at that time, was instrumental in the appointment of the Binder and Anderson Committees. I appointed Professor Chandler Assistant Vice-President for Institutional Advancement (a newly-created post) in June 1974. A study of the final report of Oram Associates during the Summer of 1974 convinced Dr. Chandler and me - in consultation with the City College Fund Board - first that we should move ahead with a Development Campaign, second that we should set the total fiscal goal of the Development Campaign at no more than $25 million in the private sector, and third that we should determine the breakdown and assignment of fiscal goals to the various academic programs under the Urban Educational Model on the basis of the needs of these programs as well as Oram Associates' analysis of the probability of success with potential donors in the different private sectors.

Finally, we decided that the unofficial Development Campaign (the so-called "pre-campaign year" in every major fundraising campaign) would begin on September 1, 1974 and that the formal announcement of the Development Campaign would take place on November 20, 1975, at the Alumni Association's 95th Annual Dinner to honor City College's four alumni Nobel Laureates (Kenneth Arrow, Julius Axelrod, Robert Hofstadter and Arthur Kornberg - a fifth alumnus, Arno Penzias, has since been awarded the Nobel Prize making the College the only undergraduate institution to be so honored). It was originally intended to limit the duration of the official campaign to a three-year period following the formal announcement. However, the numerous obstacles encountered during the course of the campaign (of which more below) made it reasonable to extend the Campaign an additional nine months, until August 31, 1979, so that the total campaign period in reality covered five years.

The academic and fiscal goals of the Development Campaign were spelled out in a brochure entitled "The Urban Educational Model". Under the first academic goal, "To Educate Future Professional Leaders," came the campaign's major projects: the Center for Biomedical Education, the Center for Legal Education, the Leonard Davis Center for Performing Arts, and the Center for Communications and Public Policy.

The second goal, "To Develop Research and Provide Service in Areas Related to the Quality of Urban Life," sought support for the Institute for Clean Fuels, Programs in Urban Architecture, Institutes for Human Development and Multi-Ethnic and Multi-Cultural Studies and CUNY's City College-based Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Sciences.

The third goal, "To Promote the Widespread Diffusion of Skills and Knowledge," found implementation in the Center of Academic Skills, programs in bilingual and bicultural education, a campus high school, and programs in continuing adult education.

To the first three goals of the Development Campaign were added a fourth goal: "To Perpetuate the Highest Standards of Learning"; under this rubric, the College aimed to raise funds to enrich the holdings of the Morris R. Cohen Library and also to endow faculty chairs, graduate fellowships and undergraduate scholarships. The fifth and final goal of the Development Campaign, namely "To Foster a Humane Campus Environment" at the College, told of needs to improve student facilities and student aid programs.

As I indicated earlier, Dr. Chandler and I confronted a series of obstacles from the very start in managing the Development Campaign. Some we anticipated and others we did not. The negative attitude of many alumni towards the College because of "Open Admissions" required careful attention. We were aware that many alumni felt that academic standards at their Alma Mater had declined seriously as a result of "Open Admissions." But we were not prepared for the degree of misinformation and disaffection that we encountered.

Moreover, an unexpected obstacle impeding the campaign in its preparatory phase was the negative economic climate. Apart from the stock market reaching a 12 year low, the first seismic rumblings of the New York City fiscal crisis were beginning to make themselves heard. By the time we opened the Development Campaign officially on November 20, 1975 at the annual banquet meeting of the City College Alumni Association, the rumblings had become earth-shaking tremors, culminating in the budgetary blood-letting of the Summer of 1976. Apart from the budgetary reductions, which required a 17% cut over a two-year period in the CUNY budget, forcing it to drop from its payroll some 4500 full-time employees, including 2500 faculty members and administrators - figures that made it by far the severest academic retrenchment in anyone's memory - the enormous economic and political pressures generated by that fiscal crisis in the Summer of 1976 had two further consequences:

> 1) It ended the 129-year-old policy of free tuition for city residents and imposed charges that were among the highest for public colleges and universities in the country...2) It altered the controversial and ambitious promise of Open Admissions - introduced in 1970 to aid the social and economic rise of masses of New York's new migrants much as the university had done for earlier waves of dispossessed newcomers.

When we unofficially embarked on the Development Campaign on September 1, 1974, there were indications of a growing fiscal crisis in New York City but it was not until a year later, when we officially opened the Campaign, that evidence for the crisis was growing by leaps and bounds (e.g. at the very time in November 1975, when the four alumni Nobel Laureates were helping us officially open the Development Campaign, there was a complete cessation of construction on the City College campus, with guards left to watch over the steel girders that were Aaron Davis Hall and the North Academic Center). Dr. Chandler and I decided that the College's needs - as defined by the Urban Educational Model - would not diminish nor disappear because of the state of the economy. We reasoned, perhaps naively and with "fingers crossed", that these needs could be met only in the private sector. If the programs were well-planned, well-led and well-presented, then there was every reason to go forward.

In searching for funds from the private sector, several projects were able to overcome the reluctance of many foundations and most corporations to make gifts to public institutions, educational or other. Corporations for the most part have made grants in areas from which they will benefit in research or recruitment. Foundation funds have been accessible for programs in medicine, education and law. Few funding sources in the private sector are willing to support programs at public institutions in any branch of the humanities, social science or basic educational opportunity (a striking exception was the Mellon Foundation).

When we announced the formal opening of the Development Campaign on November 20, 1975, we had been careful to design the Urban Educational Model with ambitious but reasonable goals. Despite this care, some students and faculty were critical of the Development Campaign's special programs which they feared would benefit a relatively small number of students at a time when the College's traditional educational programs were experiencing serious cutbacks as a result of the city's fiscal crisis. (I might say, parenthetically, that the unrestricted monies raised in the Development Campaign were used to save faculty jobs and programs in the traditional departments during the dismal Fall of 1976, following retrenchment.) It was my conviction, however, that the implementation of the special programs under the Urban Educational Model would enhance the academic image of the entire College and that the flexible design of the Development Campaign had made ample provision for the regular academic programs when attractive proposals were prepared. This conviction was fortunately borne out by later results. The monies raised for the programs, institutes and centers under the Urban Educational Model could be used to benefit much larger numbers of students in the traditional programs (both liberal arts and professional studies) as the programs, institutes and centers under the Urban Educational Model matured (e.g. the enriched Pre-Medical Program could receive support from monies raised for the Biomedical Program). A good example of the flexible design of the Development Campaign was its capability to raise a substantial sum for the liberal arts (i.e. the one-half million dollar Mellon Grant for the LAPP programs) when a suitable proposal was prepared.

A decision had to be taken very early as to whether the Development Campaign would be managed with inside staff or by an outside professional fundraising entity. The inability of the City College Fund to provide a sufficient operating budget for the Development Campaign - due to the large costs involved - compelled the City College administration to undertake the arduous task of managing the Development Campaign itself. It was for this reason that Dr. Chandler was placed in charge of the Development Campaign during its first two years. When she became Provost of the College in September of 1976, Dean Theodore Gross was made Acting Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement to take charge of the Development Campaign. It was not until September 1977 that the Development Campaign was placed under the direction of a professional fundraiser, Assistant Vice President of Development Vincent McGee, to complete the final two years of the Campaign. Throughout the five-year period, Lawrence Weiner, Executive Director of the City College Fund, assisted with the alumni phase of the Development Campaign. Arnold Picker was President of the City College Fund; he was succeeded by Michael Pope. Both were energetically involved with the Development Campaign. Special mention should be made of the extraordinary efforts of Jerome Udell, Class of 1918, who functioned as a special one-man development committee, instrumental in raising significant sums from alumni and others interested in the College. Throughout the Development Campaign, Leonard Davis gave freely of his advice as did the City College Board of Visitors under the Chairmanship of Judge Stanley Fuld and the Vice-Chairmanship of Judge Robert Mangum. (The Board of Visitors consisted of approximately 30 outstanding alumni and friends of the College who advised the president on all aspects of the Urban Educational Model and the Development Campaign.) To these persons the College owes a deep debt of gratitude as it does to all its benefactors, large and small, and to the many members of the faculty and administration who supported and worked for its goals.

Despite the many obstacles encountered during the course of the Development Campaign and despite the prophets of gloom who were cynical about a Development Campaign, the College raised $18.4 million - by far the largest amount of money in the private sector that ever had been raised. (The amount raised during the first four years of my presidency - including the Davis gift of $2.5 million - was $8.4 million so that the total amount raised in the private sector during the nine years of my presidency totalled $26.8 million.) In addition to the monies raised in the private sector during the Development Campaign, it was expected that private funds would generate additional non-tax-levy funds from the public sector: from the federal government and from city and state agencies which do not contribute to the normal tax-levy budget of the College. This expectation was fulfilled and in excess of $8 million were raised in the public sector during the five-year period September 1, 1974 - August 31, 1979 for college projects initiated by private funds. When one adds this amount to the $18.4 million, the total in gifts, grants and pledges, from private and public sources, raised to develop and sustain the programs of the Urban Educational Model, exceeded the campaign goal of $25 million.

This achievement was possible because the City College Development Campaign was conceived as organic and fluid in its fundamental style and design and not as a rigid and brittle structure. When the fiscal crisis of New York City led to the questioning of the future existence of City College itself, it was pointed out that public higher education simply had to be continued in New York City and that, as the flagship institution in City University, City College would survive as a major public institution of higher education. When it was discovered that the corporate sector had a strong negative bias towards channeling support to public colleges and universities, an appeal was made to federal agencies to help support programs under the rubric of the Urban Educational Model which had been created with private funds. When alumni aired their doubts about the maintenance of academic standards at the College, it was possible to counter these concerns with information concerning the high degrees of academic preparation required to enter many of City College's programs (both old and new) and to invite these same alumni to contribute their support to the City College Scholar Award Program in order to guarantee that larger numbers of the best and the brightest high school graduates would enroll at City College. However, the major reason for the success of the Development Campaign was the remarkable generosity of a small number of alumni and non-alumni friends of the College as well as the interest in several new programs under the Urban Educational Model on the part of a small number of foundations willing to make grants in the public sector. These donors found the Urban Educational Model highly attractive and agreed that this urban-oriented academic master plan constituted an appropriate reformulation of the humanistic mission of City College for the Seventies and beyond.

To gain a proper perspective of the importance of the Development

Campaign for City College during the five-year period September 1, 1974 to August 31, 1979, it should be noted that the total tax-levy budget of the College for that five-year period was $215.4 million. In other words, the Development Campaign augmented the tax-levy budget of the College by 11.8%. This figure compared favorably with the percentage contributed by the income on the endowment of some of the wealthier private universities. Another measure of the importance of the Development Campaign during that five-year period was to compare the amount raised with the public monies (primarily from federal sources) awarded to the College for research and training purposes. The total of such funds, not directly generated by the Development Campaign, was $14.7 million, an augmentation of the tax-levy budget of the College by another 6.8%. In other words, the Development Campaign increased the contribution of non-tax-levy funds to the operation of City College by approximately 175%! Without these non-tax-levy funds (gifts, grants and pledges that were not part of the annual budget provided by the State and City), City College would have found it exceedingly difficult to discharge its weighty responsibility as an open access institution of higher learning and to maintain its reputation for academic excellence.

As a blueprint of the College's growth during the Seventies, the Urban Educational Model became an affirmative statement in a period of adversity - an assertion of faith in tomorrow. I believe that the articulation of the Urban Educational Model provided City College with a future, an image of itself which it could strive to achieve and which, in great measure, it was on the way to achieving.

When the North Academic Center is completed in 1981 or 1982, City College will have completed a major part of its physical development. The success of the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education should be matched by an ongoing performance schedule for academic and local community in Aaron Davis Hall of the Leonard Davis Center for the Performing Arts and attorneys should be at practice in the City of New York who were trained in the Max E. and Filomen M. Greenberg Center for Legal Education and Urban Policy at City College.

I can think of no more eloquent way to communicate a sense of the reasons why certain alumni responded to the call of the Development Campaign for private support of an urban public college dedicated to the twin goals of open access and academic excellence, than to quote from the late Max Greenberg's remarkable speech at the ceremony naming the Center for Legal Education for him and his wife. Max Greenberg was very active in alumni affairs over many years, having been president of the Alumni Association and the City College Fund. He and his wife Filomen had given money for music scholarships under my predecessor, Buell Gallagher. During the early stages of the Development Campaign, they had endowed the Greenberg Chair for Urban Legal Studies, a chair occupied by Professor Hayward Burns, the Director of the Max E. and Filomen M. Greenberg Center for Legal Education and Public Policy. Towards the end of the Development Campaign, Max and Fil Greenberg decided, on their own initiative, to earmark a $1.5 million gift from their estate to endow the Center for Legal Education and the Filomen Maria D'Agostino Library for Legal Education.

Here is what Max Greenberg said at the dedication ceremony on

October 19, 1978:

"Gray, in his 'Elegy in a Country Churchyard,' wrote: 'Full many a flower is born to blush unseen/And waste its sweetness on the desert air.' Nothing I've ever read has impressed me more than these few words summarizing ability, perhaps genius, frustrated from expression by lack of opportunity.

The loss is not only to the tortured soul unable to free his pent-up urge for accomplishment but to society itself. This is particularly so in a democracy. The quality of a democracy is no better than that of the citizens that comprise it. The quality of these citizens is greatly affected by the extent of their education and their freedom to bring into play their talents and capabilities.

If, by this Center for Legal Education and Public Policy, we are able to grant that opportunity to a few who otherwise would never had had it, we are very grateful.

Thank you very much!"

Epilogue

In the half-dozen years between 1964 and 1970, there collided a number of basic forces - social, economic, political, ethnic and generational - that produced a series of incidents, disruptions, skirmishes and social explosions that shook the very structures of higher education throughout the world. From San Francisco and Berkeley to New York and Cambridge, from Paris to Tokyo, not only were the curricula and governance of academic institutions abruptly challenged, the value and even the very existence of colleges and universities as centers of free inquiry were debated and questioned as never before.

Sociologists and historians will long probe into the myriad causes that led to this pervasive turbulence during the Sixties. All agreed that colleges and universities in urban settings faced the most exacting roster of problems. Many American campuses were physically surrounded by racial minorities whose expectations and anticipations had been elevated to new highs by federal court decisions and legislation in the earlier years of the decade, and whose disappointment and frustration over the non-realization of the promised improvements turned later to rage and hostility toward society, government and the educational system itself.

Some measure of the skepticism, cynicism and alienation that pervaded the City College campus in 1970 is conveyed by some passages from an article that appeared in the Black and Puerto

Rican student newspaper shortly after my appointment as president (April 1970). The article begins:

> "After months of deliberations, the Board of Higher Education has finalized its decision and appointed Robert Marshak to the vacant presidential post of CCNY. In making the appointment, there is little doubt that the BHE has bestowed Dr. Marshak with the aura of the white knight whose noble lance will ultimately slay the dragons of increasing political stife which threaten the very existence of the College. In a very superficial sense, Robert Marshak does seem to fill the requirements which the controversial post entails. He is, at the very least, a stable, "semi-famous" personality involved in a prestigious field of research - a fact which will gratify both alumni and large segments of the faculty. In addition, Dr. Marshak gives one the impression that he will try his best to communicate with the "disenfranchized youth of the seventies" - a fact which should assuage most of the radicals among us. And, last but certainly not least, he is in the last throes of the balding process - a fact which undoubtedly gratifies the hearts of the BHE ...
>
> Yet, despite the obvious capabilities Robert Marshak does possess to shoulder his upcoming responsibilities, they are of no practical use to CCNY. Perhaps they are just right for a well-endowed university that has a well-endowed student body, but they just are not compatible with City. This strange incompatibility stems from the fact that Dr. Marshak's goals and values are totally alien to the CCNY life style ..."

After further analyzing why an "academic type" like myself was unsuitable for the City College presidency, the article continues:

> "What the College needs is...a true politician who knows how to use his skill and influence in government to protect the rights and sanity of the CCNY student from the ravages of the Albany legislature...Grant you, a politician is not a member of the astute intelligentsia, but he knows where the money is hidden in Albany and knows exactly how to get it home. Once CCNY has funds, the rest is simple - construction, open admissions, and free tuition can continue and perhaps there will be enough left over for a water cooler in the library. Yet, alas, there is no such thing as a politician with 'conscience'... Robert Marshak is president of CCNY. There will be a tuition fee come September '71 (it will be passed in Albany during the preceeding summer while Robert Marshak is deep in his research work in Europe). And in Spring '72 Dr. Marshak will be academic vice-president of Hawaii U..."

(At the time I was offered the City College presidency, I had rejected overtures from institutions situated in warmer climates and/or less volatile environments for reasons given in the Preface.)

While there was a basic misunderstanding in the student article about what had prompted me to accept the City College presidency, there were some shrewd insights into my goals and values, insights that were never grasped by a small number of faculty at the College. There was simply no way that a research scientist with thirty years' experience in academe could surrender the values of academic excellence while pursuing the goals of social good and human betterment. There is no gainsaying the fact that I dedicated the nine years of my presidency to the design and implementation of a modern-day urban mission for City College. During my stewardship, I characterized this mission in different ways -- creation of an urban educational model, establishment of a multi-ethnic college of the highest quality, maintenance of academic excellence in a college with open access -- but the guiding principle was always the same: to hold precious the reputation of a college that was sensitive to the needs of its student body and the public that supported it.

It would be presumptuous of me to respond to the student article of April 1970 by passing personal judgment on the success or failure of my efforts. It seems more fitting to conclude these "Memoirs" by invoking an outside appraisal of my nine years of service as City College president by no less an "authority" than The New York Times. Shortly before my departure from City College to resume my scientific career, in a June 16, 1979 editorial entitled "The Marshak Vision of City College", The New York Times had this to say:

> "The place was a shambles when Robert Marshak assumed the presidency of New York's City College in 1970. A student revolt and racial conflict had convulsed the campus. An open admissions

policy, new and hardly under control, threatened to drown the scholarly traditions that had made C.C.N.Y. the flagship of City University and of urban higher education. The prevailing mood was to eulogize a glorious past and to write off the future.

Dr. Marshak made it instantly clear that he had come not to bury the college but to demonstrate its value to a troubled city. He understood that there was no going back to a time when City College prepared more students bound for Ph.D.'s than any other undergraduate school in the country. He pioneered in the creation of biomedical and urban legal studies, urban architecture and other programs that would open the way to new generations of different youngsters.

In promoting this model, Dr. Marshak sometimes found himself in conflict with fellow college presidents, and he antagonized some nostalgic alumni. He was able nonetheless to raise $25 million in private funds to improve his programs - a record amount that suggests that he had struck a responsive chord. Robert Marshak retires at the end of this academic year having pointed the way not only for C.C.N.Y. and for CUNY but also for higher education in all the cities of America."

The New York Times editorial looked kindly at the history of City College during the decade of the Seventies. I believe that my successor - looking ahead to the decade of the Eighties - will realize that the heterogeneous and cosmopolitan character of the City College student body provides a unique opportunity for the College to be sensitive not only to the urban ills of metropolitan centers but to the pressing global problems of human survival as well. This should lead to the enrichment of City College's humanistic mission along international lines. I suspect that a Global Educational Model of sorts will become the blueprint of City College's growth during the Eighties as the Urban Educational Model served that purpose during the Seventies.

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 703 HE 014 250

AUTHOR	Fritsma, George A.
TITLE	What Is Non-Traditional Education?
PUB DATE	[81]
NOTE	20p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Design; Definitions; Educational Objectives; Evaluation Criteria; *Experiential Learning; Higher Education; Medical Associations; *Medical Technologists; *Nontraditional Education; Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*American Society for Medical Technology

ABSTRACT

In an effort to insure that medical technologists prepared for their careers through nontraditional educational offerings are at least as competent as those graduated from traditional programs, the American Society for Medical Technology has defined the term "nontraditional education" for its own use, categorized the educational mechanisms that could be termed nontraditional, and determined the nontraditional paths that meet society criteria. Nontraditional education is defined as any approach that differs from a lecture, laboratory, and clinical experience model or any medical technology curriculum differing from the so-called "3 + 1." Two sets of criteria for inclusion in the nontraditional category are outlined. The first is of those for evaluating educational offerings as an administrative unit, and consists of: a statement of goal, learning objectives, an outline or syllabus, authoritative professional content document (certifiable materials), a statement of didactic approach, a designated coordinator who is a content expert with specific qualifications, laboratory resources made available to students, library resources, consulting personnel, evaluation components, and a record of learner achievements. Criteria for equivalency outcomes, the second set, includes: an evaluating agency, an evaluation coordinator, coordinator qualifications, content objectives with basis in an authoritative professional content document or documents, evaluation instruments (cognitive, psychomotor, and affective), minimum performance levels, and agency records. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

WHAT IS NON-TRADITIONAL EDUCATION?

GEORGE A. FRITSMA MS. CLS
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF
MEDICAL LABORATORY SCIENCES
University of Illinois at the
Medical Center
123 S.W. Glendale
Peoria, IL 61656

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
George A.
Fritsma
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ABSTRACT

Professional societies which represent Medical Technology are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a profession-based competence assurance system which provides for the evaluation of clinical laboratories and clinical laboratory professionals. Among many quality-related issues confronting the American Society for Medical Technology (ASMT) is the large number of practitioners who have achieved entry-level competence through "non-traditional" approaches. While the term "non-traditional" is vague, it includes at least such educational offerings as proprietary schools, military specialist's courses, on-the-job training, career ladder articulation, Bachelor's degree in general sciences, and courses offered in formal institutions which incorporate unusual aspects. The Topic Study Group on Non-traditional Education was formed by the ASMT Scientific Assembly to define "non-traditional" and to determine its equivalency to formal education mechanisms. The group provides here a definition of and examples for non-traditional educational offerings and some means to insure that practitioners prepared through these alternative paths are at least as competent as those graduated from traditional programs.

AUTHORITY

In 1979 the ASMT House of Delegates adopted the Philosophy for a Competence Assurance System (7). The Scientific Assembly acted quickly to form the Competence Assurance Council to implement the System. Their goal was to promote "high standards of laboratory practice," (7) resulting in quality control of laboratory data, through, among other means, the evaluation and certification of educational mechanisms and their products, entry level laboratory personnel.

Because a large proportion of the clinical laboratory work force joins the profession through non-formal paths, a system that certifies only formal or traditional offerings would be partially circumvented (5). Consequently one component of competence assurance is assessment of "non-traditional" education and its products or graduates. Therefore, the Council and the Assembly commissioned a Topic Study Group (hereinafter referred to as the Group) in October of 1979 to examine "non-traditional" education. The group received the following mandate:

1. Categorize those educational mechanisms which could be termed "non-traditional."
2. Determine those non-traditional paths which meet pre-determined criteria.
3. Publish findings and obtain the appropriate acceptance.

The group was expected to deliberate during 1980 and 1981 and prepare a final report to the Assembly and the Council in June of 1981. This is a summary of the final report.

PROCESS

The Group was assembled by correspondence in December of 1979. Members were selected to represent several types of non-traditional education. Most were educators participating in career ladder programs, proprietary schools, military laboratory specialist's course, auto-tutorials, and on-the-job training. All members had had experience in the design of competence-based curricula and all had had experience with imposing new models of education upon existing systems.

From December, 1979 through June of 1980 the Group communicated only through correspondence, each member individually responding to the comments of others through the chair who coordinated the mailings. In June, one meeting was held, in conjunction with the annual meeting of ASMT, followed by which several additional mailings served to complete the project. In general, the issues of the first mandate were considered before the June meeting, and the issues of the second during and after.

ARRIVING AT A DEFINITION

Figure 1 is a list of modes or types of educational offerings which could be called non-traditional. This grew from a mild but dynamic polarity within the Group. To define "non-traditional" one must examine a continuum of definitions ranging from the most limiting to the most inclusive (1). Using a formal college education as the representative of "traditional" education the definition could simply be "any course or program preparing entry-level technologists which does not culminate in a formal degree." At the other extreme one could use the definition "any course or program which incorporates unusual aspects." This definition would include many offerings provided within traditional institutions as well as outside. In grappling with the continuum, the Group arrived at a definition which was very inclusive:

> Non-traditional education includes any approach that differs from a lecture, laboratory, and clinical experience model or any Medical Technology curriculum which differs from the "3 + 1."

Recognizing that an inclusive definition leads to chaos, the Group offers this definition only in tandem with the list of educational modes given in figure 1. Note that "non-traditionalism" includes unusual formatting of courses, or portions of courses such as self-instruction, and use of media; and unusual curricular approaches such as career ladder or specialized degrees, credit for experience, and education in military and proprietary schools (6). The Group feels that the definition and list are both comprehensive and illuminating.

FORMING CRITERIA

The second mandate appears to require the Group to classify and select types of offerings which are acceptable. Recognizing that the variety of non-traditional offerings is infinite, the Group chose instead to generate a list of criteria by which the offering may be judged. Two aspects of criterion preparation are worthy of mention. The first was that no attempt was made to provide content-oriented objectives among the criteria. Such an effort would duplicate the efforts of other Topic Study Groups, and would extend beyond the scope of the mandate. Instead, criteria should primarily prescribe those administrative requirements that are superimposed upon routinely applied content requirements in non-formal circumstances. Content control is provided for in single criteria which simply refer to the need for authoritative documentation.

The issue of equivalency is more troublesome. To determine whether an offering meets acceptable standards it was concluded that formal educational approaches could serve as the standards. This appears to imply that the formal educational approach is the most desirable approach and that non-traditional educational offerings are being judged strictly upon whether they can match the classroom. In reality quality varies widely in both the traditional and the non-traditional offerings. Furthermore, professional competence is individually pursued and achieved. Therefore, it is important to point out that traditional education is used only because it forms the largest pool of consistent data against which other offerings may be judged. Furthermore, the criteria only provide minimum standards which may be and are likely to be transcended individually or as a group.

The criteria are provided in two lists, figure 2 and figure 3. In the first list are those criteria which may be applied to the evaluation of educational offerings as an administrative unit. These may be modules, courses, or curricula which are relatively formally organized but which may be provided either within or outside of traditional educational institutions. To use this first list a process would be established in which the presenters of a specific offering would approach the accrediting agency for consideration. The agency would then examine information provided by the presenters and determine the acceptability of the offering. A list of approved offerings would be maintained by the agency. The process would be analagous to accreditation of a school or curriculum, and could proceed prior to placing the offering in service, that is, before there are any graduates or products.

The second list is of criteria to be applied when an individual seeks equivalent credit for participation in some educational process. Use of this set of criteria alone would provide for equivalency without concern for the nature, content, or format of the individual's learning experience. This list provides for two agencies; the first is a formal educational institution which actually grants educational credit for an individual's achievement. Note that this institution must already provide course work in the equivalent subject area in order to grant credit. A second agency is referred to as the advisory agency, whose task it is to make recommendations to a credit-granting institution. This agency would develop and maintain a set of evaluation instruments such as paper and pencil tests, standard performance tests and attitude assessments which serve to evaluate individual competence. The advisory agency would be responsible for the administration of these tests and provision of evaluation data, and would maintain communication with any college or university which could grant credit.

Three models for the use of the criteria are provided by the Group. As stated, the first provides for accreditation of an educational offering, the second for equivalent credit for individuals who are the products of non-traditional preparation. The third model employs both sets of criteria in tandem. In order for an individual to gain credit both the person's abilities and the educational offering would be examined before there is approval. The use of model one or three will provide for more stringent control of personal and educational qualifications but is sure to limit creativity of non-traditional offerings and result in a high rate of exclusion. The use of model two will permit for the widest range of offerings to gain acceptibility but would result in loss of control. Processes that examine traditional offerings typically assess both the educational activity and its product.

COMMENTS:

The Group recommends that a study be undertaken to determine the percentage of clinical laboratory practitioners who enter the profession through non-traditional means. The likelihood exists that the numbers are high enough to render the need for evaluation quite essential. In addition, it has become clear that in the last three years the demand for traditional approaches to medical technology education has diminished while the numbers of members trained through the career ladded approach have assumed significant proportions. It may be that within a few years the forms of education we now call "non-traditional" will be more commonly employed than the formal courses we are now accustomed to.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Council on Education. Office of Educational Credit. *The National Guide To Credit Recommendations For Non-Collegiate Courses*. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1980.

2. Chrest, C.B. Development of a P.A.C.E. - approved Continuing Educational Program for the Community Hospital. *Am J Med Tech 44(8)*:793-5, 1978.

3. Hofherr, L. Use of Case Histories in Teaching Clinical Microbiology. *Am J Med Tech 44(2)*:137-9, 1978.

4. Jacobs, R.S. A course in Management and Supervision for Medical Technology Students. *Am J Med Tech 44(6)*:646-8, 1978.

5. Kettering Project. *Job Restructuring for the Clinical Laboratory*. Kettering Medical Center, Kettering, OH. 1976.

6. Lenburg, C.B. Non-traditional Approaches to Learning. *AORN J 26(1)*:45-53, 1977.

7. Mass, D. ASMT Unveils its Competence Assurance System. *Am J Med Tech 45(8)*:718-721, 1979.

8. Mass, D. Making Education Relevant. Am J Med Tech 45(5):349, 1979.

9. McBride, K. Task Analysis of Medical Technology Administration and Supervision. Am J Med Tech 44(7):688-95, 1978.

means of documentation. The examination must be based upon the predetermined entry-level competencies of the advisory agency, clearly defined in behavioral objective format and used consistently by all equivalence-granting institutions. The exam may be designed *de novo* by the agency or obtained from other sources provided it reflects the requirements of the objectives.

8. Evaluation Instrument: Affective.

For evaluation of affective objectives a strategy must be developed based upon the predetermined objectives of the advisory agency that are clearly defined in behavioral terms and are used consistently by all equivalence-granting institutions. The evaluation strategy may include assessments of former employers or instructors or the analysis of situation vignettes presented live, on film or videotape, or in writing.

9. Minimum Performance Levels.

For each evaluation instrument it is the responsibility of the coordinator to compute a minimum performance level based upon measurement criteria given in the objectives. The minimum pass level should be an absolute, numerical figure based upon the content and difficulty of individual test items. Determination of minimum pass levels for examinations must involve the work of a committee convened by the coordinator and must be validated with an adequate population before use.

10. Records.

Permanent, retrievable records, available upon the demand of the learner, must be provided by the agency evaluating or granting equivalency.

Figure 3

MODES OF NON-TRADITIONAL MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

Four-Year Degrees

- Four-year fully integrated BS in Medical Technology
- 2+2 university or college-based BS in Medical Technology
- Post-Baccalaureate program (4+1) with MT clinical year
- Baccalaureate program with work experience
- B.S. in Basic Science
- University-based baccalaureate with no clinical experience
- Specialty-directed B.S., e.g., Clinical Chemistry

Career Ladder Approaches

- Internal MLT-MT articulated approach
- Open articulation MLT-MT approach
- Part-time B.S. in Medical Technology for MLT's

Equivalency-Experience Recognition

- CLEP exams for course credit
- Direct credit for equivalent courses, e.g., military courses
- Equivalency testing for credit for experience
- Credit by equivalency for self-directed study
- Credit for research and publications produced

Education Outside of Usual Universities and Colleges

- Independent study courses
- Proprietary schools
- Military courses

Courses and Curricula With Unusual Aspects

- Self-instructional units
- Self-instruction using media, e.g., slides, tapes, video
- Structured continuing education workshops - traveling, conventions
- Unusual time frames, e.g., evenings, weekends, consecutive rather than concurrent courses
- Modular courses
- Telephone conferences and networks, e.g., "Telinet"
- Courses based on on-the-job clinical experience assignments tailored to student needs
- Retraining for medical technologists

Criteria For Non-traditional Education I:

Model for Educational Offerings

The following criteria may be used to evaluate non-traditional educational offerings in Medical Technology. These are confined to those course/module/or experiential offerings which contribute towards attainment of the entry level of the Medical Technology profession. These are minimal criteria, possession of which indicates that an offering is at least equivalent in quality to a formally constituted course from an accredited university, college, or School of Medical Technology. These criteria are used only to define the acceptability of the offering, and do not provide for measurement of the educational outcomes at the level of the individual learner.

1. Statement of Goal.

   A unified educational goal which defines in broad terms the content, the format (or educational approach) and the outcome of the offering must be available to the learner and recorded in official documentation. Such a statement must demonstrate that the offering is confined to a single discipline or set of objectives within a single discipline.

2. Learning Objectives.

   A set of competency-based learning objectives which define the content of the offering and which establish student-centered learning outcomes must be provided to the learners and recorded in official documentation. It is likely that any Medical Technology offering would include objectives of the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains.

3. Outline or Syllabus.

A content outline or syllabus which describes all the learning experiences in detail including the number of contact hours must be recorded in official documentation and provided for learner use. This outline may be a part of the Learning Objective document or a separate document keyed to the learning objectives by number.

4. Authority.

Learning Objectives and content outlines must be demonstrably based upon an authoritative professional content document such as the ASMT Body of Knowledge. Each objective must be referenced to at least one authority by footnote or bibliography.

5. Educational Format.

A statement which describes the didactic approach must be recorded in official documentation. This would include a description of cognitive method, such as lecture, discussion, module, individual readings, or tutorial, psychomotor method such as simulated laboratory exercise or clinical practice, and affective approaches and as discussion or trigger modules.

6. Coordinator.

Any offering must be coordinated by a designated content expert who is available to the learner on a regular basis either through personal interview or two-way telecommunication. This individual is responsible for the content and objectives and must provide individual supervision of learners to insure that objectives are being met on a day to day basis. Examples of services provided by the content expert may be lectures, discussions, consultation with learners, provision of resources such as additional lecturers, library materials, laboratory materials.

7. Qualifications of the Coordinator.

The Coordinator must be described by an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae, included in official documentation. Such an individual must possess at least a Bachelor's degree in Medical Technology or related laboratory science and must be certified as a Medical Technologist or Clinical Laboratory Scientist or in an associated specialty by a nationally recognized certifying agency such as the NCAMLP, ISCLT, AMT, or ASCP.

8. Laboratory Resources.

A list of laboratory resources such as major supplies, equipment, types and numbers of clinical specimens and physical accoutrements available must be provided to the learners and placed in official documentation. The list should indicate which objectives are supported by each major resource.

9. Library Resources.

A list of major texts, periodicals, reviews, and audio-visuals relative to the educational offering must be provided to the learner and recorded in official documentation. Such materials must be easily accessible to the learner.

10. Consulting Personnel.

A list of individuals immediately available to learners who have demonstrated knowledge within the discipline must be provided to the learner and recorded in official documentation. For each consulting individual a short biographical sketch must be included in the documentation which gives the individual's qualifications. Such individuals may include professional laboratory staff, physician staff, and faculty members.

11. Evaluation.

Any educational offering must provide for evaluation of learner achievements. Paper and pencil tests, keyed to learning objectives, should be administered for cognitive objectives. Practical examinations must be administered for all psychomotor objectives and the results recorded on a checklist or laboratory report form. Examples of evaluation instruments must be provided for evaluation of an offering.

12. Record of Learner Achievement.

Learner performance on evaluation instruments must be officially recorded in permanent documentation and summaries or averages of performance results must be available upon the demand of the learner. Such a summary should be in the form of a transcript or similar permanent document issued by the responsible institution.

kr

Criteria for Non-traditional Education II:

Individual Outcomes

The following criteria may be used to evaluate non-traditional educational experiences in Medical Technology. These are confined to those course/module/or experiential offerings which contribute towards the attainment of the entry level of the Medical Technology profession. These criteria are used to assess outcomes of non-traditional education as exhibited by the individual who has completed the learning activity and do not evaluate the offering itself. Acceptability is defined as academically equivalent to a course offering of like content in an accredited College or University.

1. The Evaluating Agency.

   In order for an institution to grant equivalence for any non-traditional educational offering, that institution must provide a similar pre-existing course or curriculum to which the non-traditional offering contributes. The non-traditional offering thus serves to substitute for an existing course or for a portion of an existing curriculum. The institution must insure that at least 75% of its graduates are educated in the pre-existing (traditional) manner. A separate agency may serve in an advisory capacity, assessing equivalence of course offerings for degree-granting institutions. This agency should maintain a list of approved offerings and establish a time limit for retention of approved status.

2. Evaluation Coordinator.

The advisory agency must have a staff member or consultant who is familiar with the content of the non-traditional course offering under evaluation. The coordinator is responsible for preparation of objectives, evaluation materials, and records. He or she must establish and monitor pass-fail criteria to determine a learner's eligibility for equivalent credit. The coordinator is expected to form a committee to share in these responsibilities. This committee should consist of at least three participants with experience in clinical laboratory science education.

3. Qualifications for Coordinator.

The coordinator must be described by an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae, kept on file by the agency. He or she must possess at least a Master's degree in Education, Medical Technology, or a related laboratory science and must be certified as a Medical Technologist or Clinical Laboratory Scientist or in an associated specialty by a nationally recognized certifying agency such as the NCAMLP, ISCLT, AMT or ASCP.

4. Objectives.

Before a non-traditional educational offering may be evaluated by an advisory agency, that agency must possess a set of properly constituted learning objectives which identify the content that must be associated with the designated discipline. Such objectives are to be produced by the Coordinator and his or her selected committee de novo or procured from pre-existing course documentation where appropriate. Objectives must include the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains.

5. Authority.

Objectives must be demonstrably based upon an authoritative professional content document such as the ASMT Body of Knowledge. Reference must be made in each objective to the applicable section in the authority.

6. Evaluation Instrument: Cognitive.

For evaluation of cognitive objectives a written examination must be used. The examination must be based upon the predetermined objectives of the advisory agency which reflect entry-level competencies which are clearly defined in behavioral terms and are used consistently by all equivalence-granting institutions. The exam may be prepared de novo by the agency itself or obtained from other sources.

7. Evaluation Instrument: Psychomotor.

For evaluation of psychomotor objectives a standard practice examination must be developed. Record of the examination may employ a checklist or other written means of documentation. The examination must be based upon the predetermined entry-level competencies of the advisory agency, clearly defined in behavioral objective format and used consistently by all equivalence-granting institutions. The exam may be designed de novo by the agency or obtained from other sources provided it reflects the requirements of the objectives.

8. Evaluation Instrument: Affective.

For evaluation of affective objectives a strategy must be developed based upon the predetermined objectives of the advisory agency that are clearly defined in behavioral terms and are used consistently by all equivalence-granting institutions. The evaluation strategy may include assessments by former employers or instructors or the analysis of situation vignettes presented live, on film or videotape, or in writing.

9. Minimum Performance Levels.

For each evaluation instrument it is the responsibility of the coordinator to compute a minimum performance level based upon measurement criteria given in the objectives. The minimum pass level should be an absolute, numerical figure based upon the content and difficulty of individual test items. Determination of minimum pass levels for examinations must involve the work of a committee convened by the coordinator and must be validated with an adequate population before use.

10. Records.

Permanent, retrievable records, available upon the demand of the learner, must be provided by the agency evaluating or granting equivalency.